

A N
HISTORY
OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE
Primitive Church,

For the *Three First* CENTURIES, and
the Beginning of the *Fourth*.

SHEWING

That the CHURCH in those first Ages,
as it has been ever since, was governed by
BISHOPS, or Officers superior to PRESBY-
TERS. Wherein also the Suggestions of *Da-
vid Blondel* to the contrary are considered.

By FRANCIS BROKESBY, B. D. sometime
Fellow of *Trinity College in Cambridge*.

L O N D O N,

Printed by W. B. for W. Taylor at the Ship in *Pater-Noster Row*,
R. Gosling at the Mitre near the *New-Temple Church* in *St. Dun-
stons Street*, and H. Clements at the Half-Moon in *St. Pauls Church-
Yard*. 1712.

AN
HISTORY
OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE
Primitive Church.

For the Three First Centuries, and
the Beginning of the Fourth.



That the Church in those first Ages
was governed by
Bishops, or Officers superior to Presby-
ters. Wherein also the suggestions of De-
vils, and the contrary are confuted.

By FRANCIS BLOKESBY, B. D. sometime
Fellow of Trinity College in Cambridge.

LONDON,

Printed by W. B. for W. J. in the Ship-street, in Pall-mall, near the
R. Office at the West-end of the Strand, in the House of the
Rev. and W. C. at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church
Yam. 1712.

TO
Mr. C H E R R Y.

SIR,

THIS following Treatise challenges You for its Patron, and demands its Dedication to Your self, in that I wrote it under Your Roof, was encourag'd in my Studies by that respective Treatment I there found, and still meet with; and withal, as I was assisted in my Work by Your readiness to supply me, out of Your well-replenish'd Library, with such Books as I stood in need of in collecting this History. I esteem my self therefore in Gratitude oblig'd to make this publick Acknowledgment of Your Favours, and to tell the World, that when I was by God's good Providence reduced to Straits (in part occasioned by my Care, lest I should make Shipwreck of a good Conscience) I then found a safe Retreat and kind Reception in Your Family, and there both Leisure and Encouragement to write this following Treatise. Concerning which Benignity of Yours, as also Your singular Integrity, and other excellent Qualities, which adorn You both as a Christian and a Gentleman; I could say more, did not Your Humility, which crowns Your other Vertues, forbid it. And indeed, Sir,

A 2

I dare

EPISTLE DEDICATORY..

I dare add no more on that Subject, lest I should now at length meet with some Expressions of Your Displeasure, of which I never hitherto observed the least in these five Years; wherein You granted me the happy Enjoyment of Your improving and delightful Conversation.

But withal, Sir, I purposed in this Dedication to have joyned to Your self that Excellent Person, and our late Learned and Pious Friend Mr. DODWELL, to testify my Gratitude to him, as for his other Favours, so particularly for his Assistance of me in this Work. For I must own to the World, that as the Chapter concerning the Chorepiscopi is, for the Substance of it, more his than mine, so much in other parts of the Work is owing to him, in that whenever I met with Difficulties I had recourse to him, whom I ever found both able and willing to resolve them; and that he often suggested to my Thoughts, things that were of singular Advantage to me in this Undertaking.

Sir, I need not tell You who was a Companion in his Studies, nor indeed other learned Men who were conversant in his Writings, of what a vast Extent his Knowledge was; as in the learned Languages, in which he was so great a Critick, in the heathen Poets, Orators, Historians, Philosophers, Sophists, &c. in all which he was admirably well skilled; so especially in the Holy Scriptures, in the Works of the best Jewish Writers, and in the ancient Christian Fathers, in which he was a perfect Master: Also in the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian; and, to name no more, in that Study in which You were his Associate,

EPISTLE DEDICATORY.

ciate, when he wrote his justly valued Book De Cyclo, I mean his Skill in History and Chronology, (in which I question whether he has left his Equal behind him) especially in the Affairs of the Church. He chiefly indeed valued the Knowledge of the first and purest Ages of the Church, by which he became so capable of assisting me in this Work. But withal, how well he was acquainted with those of After-times, is evident from several of his Works; as his Vindication of the deprived Bishops, and the Defence thereof, and his late learned and judicious Discourse of Incense, for which we are obliged to a worthy Clergyman of the Isle of Man, who occasion'd his writing it.

To the mention of his great Learning, joyned with his great Humility and Modesty, I might, Sir, add that of his singular Piety, his Zeal for God and Religion, his Concern for the Rights of the Church, his Veneration for the sacred Ministry, his Readiness to assist others in any worthy Undertakings, his very great Acts of Bounty and Charity to Persons in Distress, his strict Temperance, and Acts of Mortification, scarcely to be parallell'd in this Age, and other things wherein he was highly exemplary, and which deserve a more particular Account. But of these, Sir, You know more than I can tell You, from Your earlier Acquaintance with him.

The Remembrance of this Excellent Person, and of his singular Worth, together with my own Obligations to him, has drawn out this Dedication beyond the Bounds which I at first set my self.

EPISTLE DEDICATORY.

This, Sir, I am the less concerned for, because You cannot easily be tired with an Account of him, and his Performances, for whom You had, and for whose Memory You retain so just a Value; in whose Conversation and joint Studies You found so great Satisfaction, and for the Loss of whom both You and I cannot but be sensibly concerned. But both of us ought to submit, in that it is our heavenly Father who has bereaved us of him, and in that he himself rests from, and enjoys the Fruits of, his Labours.

Sir, I shall put an end to Your Trouble with assuring You, that when there is only one way left me to express my Gratitude, I will endeavour by God's Grace studiously to perform it, which is daily to present my Prayers for Blessings on You and Yours, and for the dear Relations of worthy Mr. DODWELL, and hereby endeavour to approve my self, Theirs, and

Honoured Sir,

Your sincerely faithful Friend,

and most humble obliged Servant,

Shottesbrooke, August 13. 1711.

FR. BROKESBY.

Govern-

Preliminary Discourse

1

Government by BISHOPS the only true Government of Christ's Church, wherein the ARGUMENTS against it, especially those of D. Blondel, are considered; the CHALLENGE renewed to shew any CHURCH, till lately, that hath not been ordered by EPISCOPAL GOVERNMENT; and a PERSUASIVE to Dissenters to return to the Communion of the Church of England. Being a PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE to AN HISTORY of the Government of the Church, for the Three First Centuries, and the beginning of the Fourth.

WHEN the Happiness of the Church, and in order thereto, the keeping of the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace, are things of the greatest moment; being such, in which the Honour of God, and the Salvation of Mens Souls are so nearly concerned; others will join with me in judging, that whatever conduces to secure and establish that Peace, and helps to disappoint the Designs of its Enemies, who restlessly endeavour to break and ruin it, must

be singularly beneficial, and thence acceptable to all truly pious Christians. Especially if we consider, that the Enemies of Christianity itself, Atheists, Deists, and the like profligate Wretches, make it their Business to widen our Breaches, and hinder the healing and closing our Ruptures; that they may dash us in pieces, or at least prevent the uniting of all serious Christians in opposing their impious Machinations. These Men are sensible that the Church of *England* is establish'd on a firm *basis*, both in respect to the Essentials of the Christian Faith, and to its Government by Bishops, a Government received from the Apostles, and continued in all Parts, and in all Ages of the Church, 'till the Change made at *Geneva*. This Church therefore they endeavour to overthrow, that they may be loose from its sacred Doctrines and holy Precepts, which give a Check to their licentious Practices, as well as that they may, if they can accomplish their sacrilegious Projects, share in the Spoil. To effect which, they know no Methods more likely to be successful, than by prejudicing Persons against the Constitutions and Government of our Church, withdrawing them from its Communion, establishing a Faction in opposition to it; and in order to maintain that Faction, destroying that Church from which they have separated, at least ruining its Apostolick Government. This might awaken such Dissenters who have any true Concern for Religion, and make them cautious, lest whilst they undermine the Church of *England*, which is the great Bulwark of Religion, they undermine Religion itself, and afford matter of Triumph to its irreligious accursed Enemies. Yet really thus do those Men, tho' they may not design it, who not only withdraw their Subjection from their Bishops, but also professedly oppose Episcopacy itself, notwithstanding its universal Reception in the Church from the
times

times of the Apostles. What these Men do, by their Sermons and private Suggestions, I dare not pretend to know; but the Books they have published, that they may depress that Government, and create a Prejudice in Mens Minds against it, are undeniable Arguments of their Aim to overthrow it. When such Books have been publish'd, and, among others, Mr. *Tallent's History of Schism*, and the Defence thereof in his Reply to the Considerations made upon it, I judged that *An History of the Primitive Church-Government* would be the best Antidote against those Books, and therefore advised my worthy Friend, the learned judicious Author of those Considerations of that *History of Schism*, to give the World such an *History of Church-Government* instead of any other Answer. But before my Letter came to his Hands, he had made a good progress in his Rejoinder, which was one Reason why he declined the Proposal. The other Reasons by him alledg'd, viz. his declining Age, and his inability for such a Work, might very well have deterred me from any thoughts of undertaking it, being sensible that in both Respects he had the Advantage of me*. Notwithstanding the Usefulness of such a Work made me overlook the Difficulties and Discouragements that I might apprehend therein, and set upon gathering Materials for it. Which whilst I was doing, the excellent *Discourse of the Rights and Government of the Church*, written by the very learned and judicious Dr. Potter, now *Regius* Professor of Divinity in Oxford, came into my Hands; where he treats of the Original of Church-Government, as founded by Christ and his Apostles, and the Succession thereof in the next Ages, together

* Tho' it pleas'd God not long after to take him from us, and to deprive us of any farther Fruits of his Labours, which otherwise we might have expected from him.

with the concurrent Testimony of Christian Writers of those first Times giving their Suffrage for Episcopacy. From which I found that such an History might in a great measure be collected, which I wished for, and hence was ready to conclude, that there was no need for me to trouble my self herewith, after this learned Person's excellent Performance. But then withal I considered, that this was but one thing that was designed in that excellent Discourse; that besides the Government, he has asserted and defended the original Rights of the Church, which some Enemies of the Church, and indeed of all revealed Religion, had struck at, in order to undermine the Church, and Christianity itself; whose Books had met with too kind an Entertainment among such who were desirous to be loose from the Tyes of Religion, which restrained them from their Debaucheries and Licentiousness. Of such extensive Advantage is the Doctors excellent Book, being levelled against several Adversaries of our Church. But because there are some Readers, who will not be at the Pains to read so large a Book, and possibly may have true Apprehensions of the Power of Christ's Ministers in general, yet stand in need to have their Notions of Church-Government rectified; such I mean, who thro' Prejudices of Education, and Ignorance of Primitive Antiquity, look upon Episcopacy as one of those Corruptions which crept into the Church in latter Ages, together with Papal Usurpations, and Popish Errors and Impurities. 'Tis a Work of Christian Charity to undeceive these deluded, tho' well-meaning Persons, and that by farther prosecuting that Subject than the Doctor has done, especially when their Error has so great an Influence on their Practice, as to hinder a present well-grounded Peace, and endanger their eternal Happiness. For whilst they entertain this Error, they securely persist in
the

the Sin of Schism, and at the same time bereave themselves of the Benefits of the Gospel-Covenants, which are conveyed by the Sacraments; in that none can authoritatively administer these, so as to have their Acts confirmed in Heaven, but such as are commissioned by Christ, and receive Authority from him; and this none can ordinarily have, but by the Imposition of the Hands of Bishops, who succeed the Apostles, whom our Saviour invested with that Power. Now whatever Charity may incline us to hope in Cases of Necessity, yet what Excuse can be made in this Kingdom, where such Necessity cannot be pretended? Especially if we add, that here none can separate from the Communion of their Bishop, and those Presbyters that are under him, without involving themselves in the Sin of Schism; a Sin which destroys Charity, the greatest Characteristick of Christ's Disciples, and dissolves that Bond by which Christ's Church is united as a Society; a Sin which the Holy Scriptures condemn, and the Fathers, that lived near the Apostles time, paint in black Colours; which, if seriously considered, would make them that are guilty thereof, and much more those that encourage them in that Guilt, to tremble.

There have been indeed many excellent Treatises written to awaken and convince these Men of their dangerous and mischievous Error. But yet withal, I cannot but think, that when the Government of the Church by Bishops is, by a plain Narrative, shewn to be founded by Christ and his Apostles, and to be that Government by which the Church in the Age immediately after the Apostles was governed, and thus continued in all Ages following, and in all parts of the Church, 'till a new Model, on a secular reason, was erected not two hundred Years ago at *Geneva*: This may conduce to remove the Prejudices against Bishops, which
so

so many have entertained, to the great Disturbance of the Church, and the Hurt of their own Souls.

Now when their Prejudices arise from one of these false Notions: (1.) That *Bishop* and *Presbyter* is the same Office, and that mere Presbyters are invested with the Power of Ordination, and other Acts which Bishops challenge as appropriate to their Office, and that a Bishop was only Moderator or Chairman in Ecclesiastical Assemblies: Or, (2.) Admitting the Offices were distinct, that a Bishop is only the Pastor of a single Congregation, and that Diocesan Bishops, who are over many Parochial Churches, are Criminals. I shall endeavour to remove both these Prejudices, and shew how little ground there is for them in the following History.

In considering the first of these Opinions, I have chiefly had regard to what the learned *David Blondel* has said in his *Apology for St. Jerom's Opinion*, where he has amassed a great Heap of Collections out of ancient and modern Writers. In which Work he has discovered his vast reading, and acquaintance with such Writers; and has, with a peculiar Nicety, settled the time wherein each of them wrote, with some not-unuseful Observations; but, together with this, has dictated with Confidence without proof, wrested and forced the Fathers to speak what they never intended, to serve his *Hypothesis*. This I have observed in the Treatise, in their proper Places. However, I shall here consider some general Positions of his, whereby he endeavours to advance the Cause of Presbytery.

But before I enter on that Discussion, I shall here consider one thing wherewith several Dissenters, and I hope some of them truly conscientious, are prejudiced against Bishops, and that is, that we find not in the History of the New Testament that the Apostles instituted Bishops, and settled them in peculiar Churches. In answer to this, I might desire them

them to shew me where the Apostles instituted the Observation of the *Lord's Day*, the Abolition of the Jewish Sabbath, and the Introduction of the Christian Sabbath, and where these things are mentioned in the History of the New Testament; and yet they observe this great Christian Festival, and that with the greatest reason, in that it has been constantly, and in all Ages of the Church, observed and celebrated; especially, when the reason of its Celebration may be inferred from sundry Passages in the Holy Scriptures. And the like may be said concerning the baptizing of Infants. The same we assert, and can prove of the Government of the Church by Bishops, that it has been used in all Ages, and in all Parts of the Church of which we have any Knowledge; and we have enough in the Holy Scriptures to shew the Reasonableness of its general Reception and Continuance. We say concerning this, as also the Observation of the *Lord's Day*, and the Baptism of Infants, that these being Matters of Fact, and so easily apprehended by the meanest Capacities, and by their constant use as easily transmitted to Posterity, there was not that Necessity of their being delivered in the Holy Scriptures, as there was for Matters of Faith. But then, (2.) There is yet a farther reason why the Institution of Bishops is not recorded in the History of the New Testament, which cannot be said of the Observation of the *Lord's Day*, and of Infant Baptism, and that is, because Bishops were not settled in particular Churches (the Church of *Jerusalem* only excepted) 'till after the History of the *Acts of the Apostles* ends, which was about the thirtieth Year after Christ's Ascension; the Apostles all that time, and somewhat after, administering the Government in their own Persons, or by Persons invested with Apostolical Power, whose Commission was not confined to particular Churches. And consequently,

sequently, if this Government was not then settled, what occasion or place could there be for the mention of it in that sacred History? Besides, the *Acts of the Apostles* comprize not the Labours of all, nor of the greatest part of the Apostles, which they employed in propagating the Gospel, and in planting of Churches. That History tells us little of St. *John*, and of the two St. *James*'s; and tho' much of St. *Peter* before, yet little after the second and third Year after Christ's Ascension, however nothing after his miraculous Deliverance out of Prison, besides his Presence and Speech at the Council of *Jerusalem*; and nothing of the rest of the Twelve; in that St. *Luke* chiefly relates the Acts of St. *Paul*, (who', tho' not one of the Twelve, was not the least of the Apostles) of which he was an Eye-Witness, and this to St. *Paul*'s Arrival at *Rome*, where he was two Years detained a Prisoner. In all which time, wherein the Apostles governed the Churches, there could be no occasion to speak of the Institution of Bishops, there being none at that time set over particular Churches. As for the Epistles of the blessed Apostles, they were written on particular Occasions, for the Use, and according to the Exigencies of the Churches, or Persons to whom they were sent.

The Government of the Church, as it was at that time, is therein supposed, and not by those Epistles settled or instituted. Besides, several of the Apostles lived some time after the Books of the New Testament were written, in which time they might receive Revelations about settling the Government of the Church. For we find God revealed his Will to 'em gradually, according as they were prepared to receive such Revelations, and the Exigencies of the Church required the Manifestation of them; as we find it was in the Case of receiving Persons, that were not circumcised, into the Christian *Peculium*,

lium, (of which *Acts* x. and xi.) which at that time was entertained with Difficulty, and probably before that time would have met with greater Opposition. No doubt God saw when was the proper Season to guide the Apostles by his Holy Spirit, in this great Affair of settling the Government of his Church, which he did by several Steps and Gradations; as at first to do it by the Apostles themselves, and by others invested with extensive Apostolick Power, while the Church was in its Infancy; so afterwards, when it was much enlarged, and particular Churches modelled, and brought to greater Perfection by their personal Inspection and Direction, than it was possible they could be reduced to at their first Plantation; then was a fit Season for settling Bishops to preside and govern Churches, which they themselves could not much longer do, when their Departure was at Hand.

Neither doth this at all derogate from the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, which is asserted in the Articles of our Church. Doctrines and Matters of Faith may be mistaken, and hence 'tis more expedient that these should be committed to Writing, than such things as are obvious to all, and which may easily be understood by Persons of mean Capacity, and when the same is continued from one Age to another; especially if such, wherein the universal Church unanimously concurs, and in which all Christians are concerned. In such a Case, there is less need to have the thing committed to Writing. Such is the Government of the Church, and such are the Officers by whom it is managed. But in this Case we say, that tho' we have no Account in the Scripture-History of the Institution of Bishops, or however of Officers superior to Presbyters, being set over particular Churches; neither could it well be, in that the Apostles themselves governed the Church 'till after the time wherein the

Acts

Acts of the Apostles ended. Yet we have sufficient Evidence from the holy Scriptures that this was done, as presumptive from what our Saviour and the Apostles did in laying the Platform of the Church, so especially when we find Bishops placed in particular Churches, even in the times of some of the Apostles. For, (1.) We find our blessed Saviour laying a Foundation for this Disparity and Subordination of Church-Officers, in his choosing first the Twelve Apostles, and then afterwards the Seventy, inferior to the Apostles; by which he clearly manifested how he would have his Church, when arrived to a full Stature, governed by this Difference of Officers which he made in its first Formation: Of which see more *Chap. i.* (2.) This Method the Apostles afterwards pursued, when they, after they had gathered and planted Churches, ordained and appointed Presbyters to teach them whom they had discipled, to observe Christ's Commands, and perform other Ministerial Offices, and yet reserve the Government of those Churches in their own Hands: Of this see *Chap. iii, iv.* (3.) And afterwards, when on God's extraordinary blessing of their incessant Labours, Churches were multiplied, they invested *Timothy* and *Titus* (and no doubt many others, besides them who are mentioned in the New Testament) with Apostolical Power, and committed to them the governing of Churches, (which they themselves could not attend, in that they were employed in propagating the Gospel in distant Places.) Which Persons ordained Presbyters in the Churches to which they were sent, yet never empower'd these Presbyters to ordain others, or to govern the Churches in which they were placed; this Power residing still in these Apostolical Persons, and in the Apostles themselves who gave them their Commission. By which they made it clearly appear, that these higher Prerogatives in the Church belonged not

not to Presbyters, but to themselves and the Apostles, and so should afterwards be devolved upon the Bishops, who were to be the Successors of the Apostles. But yet farther: (4.) This Authority appears from the Holy Scripture, not only to be implied and designed for the Bishops as Successors of the Apostles, but to be actually committed to them, viz. To such as were the Governours of particular Churches, as well as to *Timothy* and *Titus*, &c. whose Provinces were probably of larger Extent. This is evident in the seven Churches of *Asia*, Rev. ii. and iii. which we find actually governed by Bishops, who are there called the *Angels* of the Churches, to whom it is manifest that the Administration of the Government in those Churches was solely committed, when they, and they only, are blamed for the Neglect of Discipline on Offenders, and they only are commended, where the Churches under their Care flourished and prospered, as being the Effect of their pastoral Inspection and Administration; in both which the Presbyters have no share: Of which see *Chap. vi.*

So that I may now safely affirm, and expect that impartial Readers should be of my mind, that there is as clear and full an Account of the Establishment of Bishops in the Christian Church, and this by the Apostles, and consequently by God himself, who by his Holy Spirit guided and directed them; and this proved from the holy Scripture itself, as can be expected in such a Case: And this Proof as clear and full, if not clearer and fuller, than of the Observation of the Lord's Day, and of Infant-Baptism. Tho' the great Confirmation of our Faith, in the Belief of all these, and the Reasonableness of our Continuance in the Observation and Use of them, is their being universally received in all Parts, and all Ages of the Christian Church; because there could not have been such an unanimous Consent

a.

herein,

herein, had they not been appointed and settled by the first Founders and Planters of the Church, *viz.* the blessed Apostles. That there was settled every where a Government by Bishops, as distinct from, and superior to, Presbyters, within forty Years or less after the Death of the Apostles, is acknowledged by the most learned Champions of Presbytery, *Salmasius*, † *Blondel* & *Daillee*. And if then, how they came to know that it was not earlier, and that a Change was then made of what they suppose was settled by the Apostles, tho' contrary to the Practice of the Apostles, who entrusted that Power in Presbyters, deserves our Enquiry. Have they any ancient Writings of Persons of that time or near it, that tell us this? *St. Jerom's* Assertion, who lived near three hundred Years after, is too late, unless he had produced the Testimony of some, who lived about that time, to assert it: But this he has not done. Neither he nor his Followers give any Account where, or when, or by whom the Change was made. Common Reason shews, that such a Change all over the World could not be made, and not be taken notice of, and not opposed by interested Persons, whose Rights were invaded and violated by such a Change. If Presbyters were by the Apostles themselves invested with an equal Power of governing the Church, of Ordaining, &c. 'Tis strange that all of them, in all parts of the World, should tamely part therewith, that no Church, nor Presbyter should assert their Rights, but all quietly submit to the Change without any Reluctance. Of this see more *Chap. xiii.*

But besides all this, *Polycarp*, that blessed Martyr, was made Bishop of *Smyrna* by the Apostles themselves, as we are told by *Irenaeus*, (l. 3. c. 3.) who knew that holy *Polycarp*. And this sufficient-

† *Blond. Præfat. p. 11.*

ly contradicts the Assertion of Bishops not being settled 'till forty Years after the Apostles time. The like appears in St. *Ignatius*, a Disciple of St. *John*, being made Bishop of *Antioch*; which as it is manifest from his excellent Epistles that testify his Concern for that Church, written when he was going to be martyred, so do they satisfactorily shew the Eminence of Bishops above Presbyters; and this so plainly, that the Presbyterians find no other way to evade it, but by denying the Genuineness of those Epistles. But with what weak Arguments, how great soever the Attempts have been, is shewn in the strenuous Vindication of those Epistles by the very learned Bishop *Pearson*, at which some have carped, but to which none have returned an Answer. As likewise how plainly the distinct Orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, and the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, appears in those Epistles of St. *Ignatius*: And again, how the Management of Church Affairs resides in the Bishop; and how necessary it is for all Officers and Members of the Church to be in Subjection to the Bishop, and in Communion with him. Now nothing could be done validly without him, or by those appointed by him; and all this by divine Authority: See this made out *Chap. vii.* I might here add concerning this blessed Martyr, who was so ready to die, and to be made a Spectacle to Mankind for Christ's sake, that he cannot be thought so unjust, as formerly to assume such an Authority to himself, and when in Prospect of Death, to assert it to belong to Bishops; and so zealously to require a Submission to be paid to 'em by Presbyters as well as by the Deacons and the Laity; had he not known that this by divine Right was their due, an Institution of God himself, which they received from the Hands of the Apostles. And certainly 'tis the Concern of all Christians, to beware lest they

become *ἑσπέραιοι*, fighters against God, and Opposers of his Institutions.

Having considered this Objection, I proceed now to represent the grand Maxims of *D. Blondel*, which are the main Foundations of his elaborate Apology; if these are weak, the Superstructure must fall. This I the rather undertake, because this Book of his is the great Magazine, out of which the Champions for Presbyterian Parity borrow their Armour, and in which they so much triumph; I shall do it that I may evince how weak and unconvulsive his Reasonings are, and hereby shew on how sandy a Foundation the Superstructure of Presbytery is erected, and of how little Service all his Pains are to weaken the established Government of the Church of *England* by Bishops.

I. Of how little Force is that Argument which *Blondel* uses, and which goes through a great part of his Book, that because *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος*, which we translate *Bishop* and *Elder*, are used promiscuously in the New Testament, and do often signify the same Office; to conclude that therefore the Office of Bishop and Presbyter are the same, and that the Presbyter is invested with all Church-Power; and that when many of the Fathers of the fourth and following Centuries (who lived in an Age when *Blondel* owns Bishops were every where settled, and had been so before that a long time, a Government to which these Fathers submitted, or themselves exercised,) do interpret, and that rightly, that by the Word *Bishops* Presbyters were meant, as *Phil. i. i.* and other Places, that therefore they thought that Bishops and Presbyters were the same, and not distinct Offices. When (i.) at the time when the *Acts of the Apostles*, and *St. Paul's Epistles* were written, there were no Bishops settled in particular Churches, in that the Apostles themselves, during

that time, administred the Government of the Church in their own Persons; and after, when Churches were multiplied, by some eminent Persons, such as *Timothy* and *Titus*, whom the Apostles invested with Apostolick Authority over many Churches, with Power to Ordain, &c. Is it any wonder if afterwards, when the Apostles ordained and appointed Persons to be their Successors in the Government of particular Churches, that the Words which had been used more largely, so as indifferently to signify any Ministers of Christ, should then be confin'd to a narrower Sense? So as *Episcopus* or Bishop should be appropriated to the highest Rank of Christ's Ministers, who succeeded his Apostles in governing the Church, and the Word *Presbyter* to the next Rank of Ministers. We find that St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 1.) and St. John (2 Joh. 1.) notwithstanding they were Apostles, and so of the supreme Order in the Church, styled themselves Presbyters*; and as I may presume that our Dissenters will not, from the use of the Name, degrade the Apostles, and equal them with ordinary Presbyters, so neither should they advance Presbyters to an Equality with Bishops, because the Name of Bishops was given them. It would be easy to give several Instances, but that it would be tedious to the Reader, how Words at several times have been used in different Senses, and particularly in Words denoting Offices, how they were applied to signify sometimes one Office, afterwards another. As the Word *Imperator*, which first signified the General of an Army, afterwards was appropriated to the Roman Emperors, otherwise styled *Augusti* and *Cæsares*: And how the Word *Cæsar*, which was at first given

* May not Presbytery 1 Tim. iv. 14. denote the College of the Apostles, or some Number of them, with whom St. Paul joyned in imposing Hands on *Timothy*?

to him who had the supreme Authority, was afterwards appropriated to him who had a Share in the Government, but yet subordinate to the supreme Emperor. But I shall consider chiefly the Word *Presbyter*, or Elder, and shew how it was used among the Jews, from whence came the like different Acceptation thereof in the Christian Church.

Whoever was Head of a Family, he was the *Elder* thereof, and his Children and Servants were subject to him; and yet he was subject to his Father, who was his Elder; and yet even this Man was subject to his Father, who, if the ancientest Survivor, was elder to, and had the supreme Authority over, all the rest; even over those who were supreme in their own Family he was the *Rosh Avoth*. Thus *Kobath* and *Merari* were Elders in their own Family, yet subject to *Levi*, and he to *Jacob*, who, whilst alive, was their supreme Elder. So that tho' the Name *Elder* was given to each of them, yet hence none can say that they were of equal Authority. *Aaron* was called Priest; *Cohen*, as well as his Sons, the Priests of an inferior Order; and (as 'tis observed by learned Men, he is never called by any other Name; and yet none will conclude from this promiscuous use of the Word, that the other Priests were *Aaron's* Equals. As none could infer that such, on whom the *Roman* Emperors conferred the Title of *Cesar*, were their Equals; because at first that Title had been given to the supreme Emperor. I might here take notice how the Word *Ἐπίσκοπος*, *Bishop*, has had various Significations, and was used to denote several Offices among the *Athenians* and *Romans*, and so used in the *Seventy's* Translation of the Old Testament. But omitting that, I shall only consider it as used in the New Testament. In general, it signifies an *Overseer*, and so is translated *Acts* xx. 28. Particularly, 'tis applied to the Office of an *Apostle*, *Acts* i. 20.

from

from which *Judas* by his Transgression fell; unless we refer it (as † a learned Person doth) to his bearing in the Bag, and being Almoner among the Apostles. But withal, we find it attributed to *Christ* himself, who (1 *Pet.* ii. 25.) is called *the Bishop of our Souls*. Hence 'tis no wonder that these, who under *Christ* have the Care of Souls committed to them, his Ministers of the second, as well as of the superior Order, are thus stiled by *St. Paul*. Tho' afterwards it became appropriated to the highest Order, *i. e.* to those who succeeded the Apostles in governing the Church. The like might be urged of the Word *Διάκονος* in the New Testament, and Bishops called some *Condiaconos* *.

From all this we may see how unreasonable and fallacious it is to argue from the ambiguous Use of Names and Titles, and to conclude that Bishop and Presbyter are the same Office, because the Names are used to denote the same Office in holy Scriptures, especially during the time whilst the Government of the Church, which is the proper Office of Bishops, was in the Hands of the Apostles. But after that time, the Name of *Apostle* (which was esteemed too great for their Successors in the Government of the Churches) the Name of *Bishop* was constantly appropriated to them, as that of *Presbyter* to the inferior Order, which the ancient Fathers never apply to Bishops of their own time; and if to those of former times, 'tis not with respect to their Office but their Age, as it signifies an *old Man*, at least to their Antiquity in the Church ||; as is evident from what *Blondel* cites out of *Papias*, presently to be mentioned.

† V. Cl. *Dodwelli* *Par.* §. 30.

* *St. Chrysostom* on *Phil.* i. 1. observes that *Presbyters* at first were called *ἐπισκοπος* and *διάκονος*.

|| See this fully proved by *Bishop Pearson*, in his *Vindic. Ignat.* part. 2. cap. 13.

2. Another Argument of *Blondel's*, which he much insists on, is, that Bishop and Presbyter are by the Fathers *both* comprized under the Name of *Sacerdotes*, both called *Priests*, in Opposition to, and Distinction from Deacons; that therefore they are the same Office, and that these Fathers made no Difference betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, but supposed them both to be invested with the same Power. That because they divide the Clergy sometimes into two, the *Sacerdotes* and *Ministri*, ἱερεῖς and Διδάσκαλοι, comprizing both Bishops and Presbyters under the first Appellation, that thence they judged them to be the same Office. For which he cites *Origen*.

In answer to which I might have observed, that *Hilary*, who goes under the Name of *St. Ambrose*, *St. Jerom*, and others whom he cites for this, lived in the fourth Century well advanced, at a time when all own that Bishops, and those superior to Presbyters, were every where established in the Church, and which *Blondel* himself acknowledges to have been done about two hundred Years before that time. As also that they, who are cited for comprizing both Orders under the Name of Priests, have given their Suffrage for Episcopacy. See *Chap. xiv.*

But omitting that, I shall (1.) observe, that the ancient Fathers speak of the Officers of the Christian Church, as nearly resembling those of the Jewish Church. To these *St. Clement* himself in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, c. 40. and even *St. Jerom* resemble the Church-Officers under the Gospel; there were the *High Priest*, the *Inferior Priests*, and the *Levites*. "What *Aaron* and his Sons, and "the *Levites* were in the Temple (saith *St. Jerom*, "Ep. ad Evag.) the same are Bishops, Presbyters "and Deacons in the (Christian) Church." Now none can truly argue, that because the two first Or-
ders

ders in the Jewish Church are called Priests, and by that were distinguish'd from Levites, that therefore they were both of the same Order^{*}; that because *Aaron* is always in the Old Testament call'd Priest, *Lechoben*, therefore he was not of a superior Office to his Sons, in that they were likewise called Priests. When the High Priest had a Jurisdiction over the Priests of the second Order, and God had appointed some peculiar Functions, particularly on the great Day of Attonement, for him only to execute. There were indeed some Offices, which either the High Priests or the Inferior Priests might discharge, yet such that the Levites had no Authority to execute, tho' these were God's Ministers, Assistants to the Priests, and could perform some sacred Rites, which Persons of other Tribes could not officiate. The Gospel Dispensation nearly resembles this. There's an Evangelical Priesthood, of which the Mosaical was a Type. We have an Altar, and thereon ἀνατίθμεν θυσίαν, we make an Oblation of a Sacrifice of Praise, *Heb. xiii. 10, 15. viz. the Holy Eucharist.* This Sacrifice none have Authority to offer up to God, but they who are set apart to this holy Office. Both *Bishops* and *Presbyters* have Authority to make this Oblation, (which Deacons, tho' Gospel-Ministers, have not,) and hence Presbyters are stiled by the ancient Fathers *Sacerdotes*, as well as Bishops. Notwithstanding the Presbyters enjoy the Privilege equally with the Bishop, both being Priests; yet they, even in this, exercise their Power in Dependence on, and Subordination to the Bishop, by whose Authority, and under whose Di-

^{*} *Philo* comprehends all sacred Offices under two Orders (*τὰς δύο*) viz. Priests and Levites, and yet makes the High Priest of the highest Order, and the Inferior of a second Order, (*ἡ δὲ ἑξῆς τὰς δύο*.) See this handled by Mr. Dodwell. *Dissert. Cypr. x. §. 8.*

rections, under God, they are to be governed. Whereas the Bishops Power is independent, (as is observed by the learned Mr. Bingham, *Antiq. l. i. p. 76.*) but have no Authority to ordain, confirm, and the like Offices which are appropriated to the Bishop, who in the Language of former Ages is *Summus & Primus Sacerdos*. And we shall find those Fathers, who comprise both Orders under the general Names of Priests, confining the Power of Imposition of Hands to the Bishop; particularly St. Chrysostom and St. Hierom: See more of this, *Chap. xiv.* As also you have there the reason why some of the Fathers of that time speak so magnificently of the Office of Presbyters, viz. To humble the Deacons, who, by reason of their Wealth, contemned the Presbyters. The Absurdity of which these Fathers demonstrate, when the Office of a Presbyter was sacerdotal, and in that respect equal with that of a Bishop, which the Deacons could not pretend to, their Office being only ministerial. This is plainly the Design of the Author of the *Questions* on the Old and New Testament (the same with the Counterfeit St. Ambrose) in Opposition to *Falcidius*, that equalized the Deacons with the Presbyters, whose Words on *i Tim. 3.* illustrate this thing, who speaking of Bishops and Presbyters, says, *uterque Sacerdos est, sed Episcopus primus est; ut omnis Episcopus Presbyter sit, non omnis Presbyter Episcopus.* This is observed by learned Men†, “ That the Antients frequently divide the Officers
“ of the Church into *Sacerdotes* and *Ministros*, and
“ as commonly subdivide the *Sacerdotes*, the Priests,
“ into the higher and lower Stations; as St. Jerom,
“ in his Book *adv. Lucifer. Ecclesia salus in Summi*

† Bishop Parker's Government of the Church for the first 600 Years, p. 43.

“ *Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, aliter tot Schismata*
 “ *essent quot Sacerdotes.* Where by *Summus Sacer-*
 “ *dos* he means the Bishop, by *Sacerdotes* the Pres-
 “ byters, whom he in another Work calls *Sacerdotes*
 “ *secundi in honore Ecclesiastico gradus.*” Yea, even
 St. Cyprian, (whose Testimony for the Distinction
 and Superiority of Bishops and Presbyters, the Rea-
 der may find *Chap. ix.*) sometimes comprising Church-
 Officers under the two Names of *Sacerdotes* and *Mini-*
stros, as *Blondel* p. 43. observes, and from it would
 infer that there was only two kinds of Officers in
 the Church at that time, and thence that Bishops
 and Presbyters were the same Office; when in one of
 his Citations out of the 67th Epistle (*Oxon.*) of St. Cy-
 prian, where he distinguishes the Ministerial from
 the Sacerdotal Office, subdivides the Sacerdotal Of-
 fice into that of Bishops and Presbyters, whom he
 distinguishes from Deacons. Omitting here his fre-
 quent mention of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons,
 as distinct Officers in the Church, and other things
 observed in the History; which shew what Author-
 ity Bishops had in the Church in that blessed Mar-
 tyr’s Days, even over Presbyters; and withal shew
 what little Modesty such Men have, who make
 St. Cyprian a Patron of Presbyterian Parity. These
 Men I refer to the learned Author of the *Principles*
of the Cyprianick Age, and its *Vindication*. Only I
 desire the Adversaries of Episcopacy, that would
 make St. Cyprian of their Party, to tell me, whence
 it is, if Presbyters were his Equals, that he never
 styles them his *Colleagues*, as he doth the Bishops? If
 Presbyters had the Power of Government, why he re-
 primands them for reconciling the *Lapsi* by their
 own without his Authority? Why must *Caldonius*
 and *Herculanus*, two Neighbour-Bishops, be called
 in to excommunicate the Schismatics of *Carthage*,
 when St. Cyprian was retired, if the Presbyters had
 in

in themselves that Power*? Why should St. Cyprian himself, in his Retirement, ordain *Aurelius* and *Celerinus*, especially when only into the lower Offices of a *Teacher* and of a *Lector*, if his Presbyters might have ordained them; and then the Ordination, in respect to some Circumstances, might have been performed with greater Solemnity than could be done in that Solitude? If St. Cyprian thought that all Presbyters were Bishops, whence comes he to declare that there ought to be but *one Bishop* in a City, and that a *Secundus* was *Nullus*; yea even in the great City, the large Church of *Rome*, where were forty six Presbyters? Whence came it in those Days, that Persons could not be admitted to Communion in Churches where they were Strangers, unless it appeared they were in Communion with the Bishop of the Church from whence they came, and this attested by the *Litteræ formatæ* of that Bishop, the Letters of Presbyters being insignificant in that Case, if Bishops had not then been superior to Presbyters? To conclude this, (tho' more to the same purpose might easily be added) Whence was it, that tho' Presbyters and others were present in *Synods*, yet the Decrees passed only in the Name of the Bishops, and was established by their Authority; if Presbyters were then esteemed of equal Authority with Bishops? See this fully handled, *Chap. x.*

3. Another Pretence used by *Blondel*, to level Bishops with Presbyters, even in the Age immediately after the Apostles, is, because Bishops were then styled Presbyters. This he brings in Opposition to the Advocates of Episcopacy, who assert,

* That *Gaius Diddensis* should be excommunicated, when he could not be present, by his Collegues, i. e. Bishops, if Presbyters had Power to have done it.

that in that Age the Word *Episcopus* was appropriated to the highest Office, and that of *Presbyter* to the next Office in the Church; for which he produces some Instances †. But this wholly arises from the Ambiguity of the Word *πρεσβύτερος*, as it signifies *an old Man*, and is the same with *πρεσβύτερος*, which will appear from the Instances which *Blondel* gives us; as particularly from that of *Papias*, out of *Eusebius*, *H. E. l. 3. c. 39*. This Person, who had never seen any of the Apostles, was yet desirous to speak with such who had conversed with them, that he might from them learn what they heard the Apostles preach: And having found some of them, he tells his Reader what he had received *ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* from those *old Men*; and then says, “If at any time I met with any who had conversed with τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, the Presbyters, or ancient Men, I enquired of them the Sayings τῶν πρεσβυτέρων of the Ancients, what *Andrew*, what *Peter* had spoken, what *Philip*, what *Thomas*, *James*, *John*, *Matthew*, or any other of the Lord’s Disciples” had taught. By which latter *Presbyters* ’tis plain that he means *Christ’s Apostles*, whom our Adversaries will allow to be superior to ordinary Presbyters. So that it’s manifest that *Papias*, in the use of the Word *Presbyters*, had no respect to this or that Order in the Church of Christ, when he never reckons up the several Orders in the Church, never distinguishes their Functions, nor mentions Bishops or Deacons, nor speaks of any particular Bishop, or Presbyter, with whom he had had any Communication. And hence what *Blondel* cites out of him is of no Advantage to his Cause.

The like might be shewn in *Irenæus’s* Words, in

† The learned Reader may find this fully handled in *Bishop Pearson’s Vindic. Ignat. part 2. c. 13. p. 166, &c.*

his Epistle to *Florinus* (*Euseb. Hist. E. l. 5. c. 20.*) οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν πρεσβύτεροι, *i. e.* "The Ancients who" were before our time delivered not such Doctrines." And so his calling *Polycarp* Ἀποστολικὸν πρεσβύτερον, an Apostolical old Man, as being ninety Years of Age, one who had conversed with the Apostles, and by them was made Bishop of *Smyrna*. These Men are at a great Loss for Witnesses in their Cause, when they would force *Irenaus* to serve them in it, when he so plainly asserts the Office of Bishops, deduces it from the Apostles, and delivers the Succession of them in some Churches from the Times of the Apostles, as is shewn *Chap. viii.*

4. Another Argument whereby *Blondel* would prove that Bishops and Presbyters are the same Office, is, because they are equally required to discharge the same Duties. It is incumbent on both of them to take heed to *the Flock of Christ*, to be Overseers of them, *to feed the Church*, to be ἡγούμενοι *Rulers*; and because the like honourable Titles, which denote Power as well as Dignity, are given to Presbyters, as well as Bishops in the Holy Scriptures, and likewise in the ancient Fathers of the Church, as πρεσβύτεροι, particularly by *Gregory Nazianzen*, who shews that they are intrusted to be over the Souls of Men, to be Guides, Χρυσὴ σωτηρίαν, to be joyned with Christ himself in the Administration of holy Offices, τῷ ἄνω κόσμῳ διακονεῖν, to administer to the heavenly Kingdom, the World above; θεὸς ἐὼν καὶ θεοποιήσας, to be in a Sense God's, as Magistrates are styled in the Holy Scriptures, and to be instrumental to make Persons participate of the divine Nature, the θεῖα φύσις, partly by their Preaching, partly by conveying in Baptism the Holy Spirit to them. Which Expressions 'tis probable the Atheists of this Age will ascribe to the Priestcraft of *Nazianzen's* Age. But passing by those Miscreants, who can spare neither God

God nor Man, I'll only consider those Expressions with respect to the purpose for which *Blondel* produces them. What I have already observed concerning the Priesthood being ascribed to Presbyters, as well as to Bishops, by the Ancients, is sufficient to answer *Blondel's* Argument, in that all those Encomiums and eminent Titles belong to them on this Reason, because they are *Priests*; and hence that many things, as the Administration of the blessed Sacraments, do belong alike to both Offices, and the same Titles of Honour which arise from the same sacred Employment of Priests, are equally conferred on them; some part of the same Respect shewn to 'em, as rising up to 'em, the same Qualifications required in both, and the same Duties of Feeding, Overseeing, &c. are required of both. Which as it shews the Dignity and the Momentousness of the Office of Presbyters, when in many things 'tis the same with that of Bishops*, so it doth not degrade Bishops from their eminent Station in the Church, or higher Degree of Priesthood, or deprive them of the sole Right of Ordaining, and the like Functions, which are appropriated to their Office, which Presbyters have no Authority to exercise. The extolling the Office of Presbyters, tho' to a singular height, is no Argument that the same Persons equal it with that of a Bishop, as is evident from what we may observe in *St. Ignatius*. He calls the Presbytery † *θεσπερέτατον καὶ ἀξιονόμαστον, πρεσβυτέριον, τὸ θεῶν ἀξίων*, which may indeed only refer to the Presbyters of that Church, but more generally he puts the Presbyters || *εἰς τόπον συνόδου τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, in the Place of the Council of the Apostles. And ‡ elsewhere speaks of them *ὡς συνόδον*

* And gives an Account of the *συνάφεια* of Bishops and Presbyters, which *Blondel* cites *St. Basil* for.

† *Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. c. 4, 12.* || *Magnes. c. 6.* ‡ *Trall. c. 3.*

Θεῷ καὶ ὡς συναδελφεύματι Ἀποστόλων, as the Council of God, and joint Assembly of the Apostles. And they are by him stiled || ἀξιοπλόκατον πνευματικὸς στέφανον τῆ περιστερῆς, the well-complicated spiritual Crown of the Presbytery. And withal, he presses the *Magnesian* † to be subject to the College of Presbyters ὡς νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as to the Law of *Jesus Christ*. And the * *Ephesians*, to obey them ἀπειρωτάτῳ ὀφειλόμενα with a steady Mind. Yet for all this, none that have read this blessed Martyrs Epistles, will say, notwithstanding the Honour he puts upon Presbyters, and the Duties he requires to be paid to them, that they are represented by him as equal with Bishops, and invested with the same Power with them; seeing he on the contrary charges them to be subject to the Bishops, and not to presume to act any thing without them, or Commission from them. These things being often inculcated in these Epistles; so that our Adversaries yield that the Author of them makes Bishops to be not only distinct from, but also superior to Presbyters; as will appear *Chap. vii.*

5. Another Argument used by *Blondel*, and often suggested by him, to make the Office of Presbyters and Bishops the same, is by telling us, that whatever supereminent Power Bishops enjoyed in the Church, was granted to 'em by Synodical Decrees; that this originally belonged equally to Presbyters, which the Synods deprived them of, and injuriously appropriated to Bishops. This he deduces from the Acts of some Councils, which condemn Presbyters meddling in some Ecclesiastical Affairs, and forbid their doing it for the future. From whence he concludes, that Presbyters had originally such Rights; that the Bishops, by challenging such things to themselves, did encroach upon the

|| *Magnes. c. 13.*† *Ib. c. 2.** *Eph. c. 20.*

Presbyters, and were guilty of Usurpation by claiming that as peculiar to their Office, which the Presbyters had equally a Right to with the Bishops, and that they were debarred from enjoying it by the Determination of Synods, and consequently only by human Authority. The whole Reasoning of *Blondel* is grounded on this Supposition, that Presbyters were never to blame in invading the Prerogatives of Bishops; that they never transcended their just Bounds, or presumed to act any thing that belonged not to their Office; and consequently stood in no need of any Restraints from their Superiors, or Regulation by Synods; but that all the Fault was in the Bishops, who ambitiously arrogated to themselves, as their Prerogative many things, which equally belonged to Presbyters.

This is *Blondel's* Reasoning, and it might have had some Validity in it, could he have given us any Instances of Presbyters *Ordaining* any to sacred Offices, of their *Confirming* Persons that had been baptized, and other Acts which we say are appropriated to Bishops; or at least, if performed by Presbyters, were not esteemed as null and invalid. But this he has not done in all that Mass of Citations which he has given us. Nay, he hath not given us (so far as I remember) one Instance, in Churches where Presbyters were of Counsel to the Bishop, that any thing was referred to be determined by their Suffrage, much less that any thing was carried by their Votes against their Bishop.

One of *Blondel's* chief Arguments to prove that the Power of Bishops over Presbyters was by synodical, and consequently human Institution, and thus acknowledged by the Church, is a Passage in the second Council of *Sevil*, which he touches on in his *Preface*, p. 33. and largely insists on, p. 75. of his *Book*, and repeats as largely, p. 175. That Council censured *Agapius*, Bishop of *Corduba*, for

xxviii Preliminary Dissertation.

appointing “ Presbyters in the Absence of the Bishop, to erect Altars and consecrate Churches.” This that Council censures, and forbids the doing it for the future, and adds this as the Reason, “ Because the Lord commanded that *Moses* alone should erect an Altar in God’s Tabernacle; it was he alone that anointed it, as being God’s High Priest; according as it is written, *Moses and Aaron among his Priests*. Therefore that which was enjoined the Chief Priests, of whom *Moses* and *Aaron* were Types, the Presbyters, who resemble the Sons of *Aaron*, ought not to presume to take unto themselves. For altho’ there be many Ministrations, which are common to them with the Bishops, yet let them know that there are some things *novellis & Ecclesiasticis regulis sibi prohibita*, which are forbidden them by the new Laws, and those of the Church, of which they give some Instances, such as the Consecration or Ordination of *Presbyters*, &c. erecting of Churches and Altars, and the blessing and anointing them; the Imposition of Hands upon, and giving the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, to such as were baptized.—For all these things are unlawful in Presbyters, because *Pontificatus apicem non habent, they have not the supreme Honour of the High Priesthood*, which Honour is due alone to the Bishops by the Authority of the Canons, that hereby the Distinction of Orders, and the eminent Dignity of the High Priest might be discerned.” From this Decree of this Council, and the Reason therein assigned, *Blondel* concludes, 1. “ That so late as six hundred Years after Christ, Presbyters are called *Pontifices*.” In return to which, (1.) I believe that this learned Man was not able to shew out of his vast reading, any ancient Father that gives the Name of *Pontifex* to any Christian

not added to the Bishop of Cordoba, as the Pontifex is called in the

ftian Priest, excepting *Tertullian**, who does it in way of ridicule. But, (2.) Neither does it appear from the Words of the Council, that this Name was then given to Presbyters, (tho' that of *Sacerdos* was:) The meaning of the Synod being only, that the highest Dignity in the Church belonged to the Bishop, in which Presbyters had no Share. *Apex* denoted the Crest in the Helmet of Warriours†. If in those Days Bishops wore any Badge of Honour on their Heads, as formerly the *Lamina* on their Breasts, possibly this Expression might allude to it.

2. *Blondel* infers, "That whatever is declared to be due alone to Bishops, is not so from its own Nature, but by human Institution, viz. By virtue of the Canons; and that if their Authority had not intervened, all those things which are reserved to the Bishop, the Presbyters had had a common Right to. And, (3.) That whatever things these Fathers declared to be unlawful to Presbyters, they were hence unlawful, because they were forbidden by *Novel* and *Ecclesiastical* Constitutions. From whence it follows, that before that Prohibition, all those things that were thereby forbidden might lawfully be exercised by them." Now when the great Stress of his Argument depends upon the Word *Novellis*, he might have observed, that the *Novella Regula* are opposed to the old Constitutions under *Moses*, and signify those Laws which were given under the Gospel; and that the *Regula Ecclesiastica* were the Rules given to the Christian Church by the Sanction of Christ and his Apostles, who were the Founders of this Church; which is evident by what is spoken of *Moses* and *Aaron* immediately before, to which this is opposed. And consequently the

* *Tertull. de Pudicit. c. i.*

† *V. Lips. de Milit. Rom.*

new, when considered with the *old* Legal Constitutions delivered by *Moses*, are not therefore of mere human Authority, when given us by them who had their Commission from Heaven. Neither doth this invalidate the Authority of these Rules, because upon their being violated, Synods enforced the Observation of them by Canons. Nor does this shew that they are of no ancienter date than such Canons, which a-new require the Observation of them, no more than when some things which are established by *Magna Charta*, are reinforced by new Acts of Parliament. Does this diminish the Authority of that Charter, or render such things Strangers to our ancient Constitution, because again ratified by new Statutes? Especially when we can shew by several Instances, that in former times they have been observed in this Kingdom, before these later Statutes were enacted. In this Case, if *Blondel* would have proved that Presbyters were deprived of those Powers by the Decrees of Synods, he should have shewn, that before such Decrees they enjoyed these Powers; and this he should have done, by giving Instances of Presbyters exercising those Powers; particularly of ordaining Persons to holy Offices. But this he has not done, nor could do, notwithstanding his Acquaintance with the ancient Fathers and Historians of the Church. And this we desire others to do, before they make use of the same Argument; otherwise all their arguing will be invalid and insignificant. And if they can produce any Instance of any Presbyters assuming such Authority, let them shew that it was not censured by the Church, and that it was not judged irregular, and of no Validity.

This I have more largely insisted on, because it has a greater shew of Reason than most which *Blondel* has given us; tho' little in Truth, when strictly examined. I have considered the Proof
from

from that Council of *Seville*, on Supposition that what we have of it is of uncontested Authority; tho' the Variety of Readings, and the Interpolations which *Blondel* himself produces, might have given him some Grounds to suspect; besides the small, or no Account we have thereof in History. I must acquaint the Reader, that tho' what our Adversaries say of the *Chorepiscopi* be of little Service to their Cause, yet because some have insisted on it, I have consider'd it *Chap. xiii.*

There is one Suggestion against Episcopacy, which, tho' entertain'd on no Ground, yet being popular must not be omitted, and that is, That this Government is *Popery*; a Word undeservedly, tho' too frequently, used by the Enemies of our Church, as a Scarecrow to fright Men from its Communion, and to prejudice their Minds against its Constitutions, tho' never so innocent. That which truly deserves that Name, are those Doctrines and Practices which are contrary to the Doctrine of Christ and his blessed Apostles, and yet have been introduced into, are retained in, and maintained by, the Church of *Rome*: Consequently, whatever is agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, consonant to the Practice of the blessed Apostles, and is evidenced to be such by its universal Reception in the first and purest Ages of the Church, (which has been in part, and will farther be proved that Episcopacy has been) is falsely and maliciously branded as *Popish*. Nay farther, the Depression of Bishops, and their being deprived of their Rights by the Encroachments and Usurpations of the Pope upon them, was a thing justly complained of, as needing Reformation. And one thing propounded as a ground of our Reformation, was the retrieving the original Rights of Bishops, which the Pope had injuriously invaded, whilst he challenged the whole Power of governing the Catholick Church, and making the

xxxii *Preliminary Dissertation.*

Bishops only as his Curates. The Pope used many Methods to diminish the Bishops Power, such as exempting the Monasteries from their Jurisdiction, and making them wholly dependent on himself, that the Monks might be Tools to secure his usurpt Authority over Bishops; in which Service the new Order of *Jesuits* have been of late chiefly instrumental. Another Method to lessen the Authority of Bishops, was the setting the Schoolmen on Work to level them, as near as possible, with the Presbyters, by their subtle and nice Distinctions.

And to name no more, the great Diligence that was used in the Council of *Trent*, to hinder the passing of the Decree for the Divine Right of Episcopacy; by whom was this done, but by the great Champions of the Pope's superlative Power? In that these Men were sensible, that the asserting the true original Power of Bishops would evince the Unreasonableness of the Pope's Encroachments on their just Rights, and shew how justly they acted, who endeavoured to retrench his Exorbitances.

And now I leave it to the Consideration and Determination of the impartial Reader, who come nearest to Popery, they who assert the Cause of Episcopacy and the Authority of Bishops against the Pope and his Adherents who endeavour to depress it, or they who with the Pope make it their Business to rob the Bishops of their just Rights, to deny their Divine Right, and (as much as lies in their Power) to equal them with Presbyters? And who promote the Interest of the Church of *Rome* most, they who defend the establish'd Government of our Church by Bishops, or they who joyn with the Papists in their Endeavours to overthrow it? At which, when they once thought it effected, they so much rejoiced; this being the great Bulwark of the Protestant Reformation.

But

But I'll conclude this with referring the Reader to others who have wrote on this Subject, and particularly to Bishop Parker's *Case of the Church of England*, p. 252, &c. where he shews that the taking away the Divine and Perpetual Right of Episcopacy opens a Door to Popery.

Before I conclude, I must offer one thing to the Consideration of Dissenters, and that is a Challenge which Dr. Bryan a Non-Conformist in his *Dwelling with God*, p. 305. (cited by Mr. Bennet in his Book of Schism) tells the Reproachers of Bishops, has been made but never was answered; it is this, *We require you to find but one Church upon the Face of the Earth, that hath not been ordered by Episcopal Government.* If this cannot be answered, and consequently it must follow, that this Government was universally received in all Places where Christian Religion was entertained, and also continued in all times, it must necessarily have its Original from the Apostles themselves. And if instituted by the Apostles, whom the Holy Spirit led into all Truth, then of Divine Institution. That is, to be esteemed as Catholick, and to be believed as such, (according to the Rule of *Vincentius Livinensis* *,) "Which is received every where, and at all times, and of all." *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.* This Challenge we still renew. And 'tis the Design of the following History to evidence, that in the three first Ages after Christ, and in the beginning of the fourth, the Church was every where governed by Bishops. And as for its universal Reception in the following Ages, there's no need of proving it, when it is owned by the learnedest Presbyterians themselves. I know an Excep-

* Whose *Commonitorium* is translated, and illustrated with learned Annotations by Mr. W. Reeves, at the end of the Christian Apologies, thus translated, and illustrated by the same learned Person.

xxxiv Preliminary Dissertation.

tion is made of the Church of *Scotland*, which is pretended to be governed at first by *Monks* and *Presbyters*. But what little ground there is for that, is fully shewn by the learned Bishop of *Worcester*, then of *St. Asaph*, in his Book written on that Subject; and is considered by me *Chap. xii.*

Having thus considered the great Arguments which have been brought for Presbyterian Parity, and that in order to undeceive them, who from such like Reasonings have separated from the Communion of the Church of *England*, I shall close this Preface with a serious and affectionate *Persuasive* to such Persons, to consider what I shall here farther offer to their Consideration.

'Tis a confessed Truth, that none can be true Christians, and in a State of Salvation, who wilfully live in the Commission of any known Sin, or persist in the Neglect of any known Duty. Now 'tis absolutely required of us, and as plainly as any other Christian Duty, that we should *keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*, *Eph. iv. 3.* And 'tis pressed there with prevalent Arguments and endearing Motives. And is it not then our great Concern, when our Interest in Christ, and our eternal Happiness depends upon it, not to violate that Command, by breaking this Unity by a needless Separation? Besides, Schisms and Divisions are not only Sins, things forbidden in the holy Scriptures, *1 Cor. i. 10.* but such as have peculiar Marks of Infamy set upon them. We are commanded *Rom. xvi. 17.* to *mark them that cause Divisions*, and in the same Place are told that these are *contrary to the Doctrine* that Christians have learned, and hence we should *avoid them*. They are branded as *Works of the Flesh*, *Gal. v. 20.* and *1 Cor. iii. 3.* They are of so mischievous a Nature, that *St. Ignatius* thought that Schismaticks deprived themselves of the Benefits procured by Christ. *Let no Man deceive himself:*

self: If a Man be not within the Altar, he's deprived of the Bread of God. If the Prayer of two or three be of such Force, how much more shall that of the Bishop and the whole Church be? He therefore that does not come together into the same Place with it, is proud, and has already condemned himself. Let us take care therefore that we do not set our selves against the Bishop, that we may be the Servants of God. Ep. ad Eph. c. 4, 5. See also ad Rom. c. 3, 4. And ad Magnes. c. 3, 4, 5, 6. ad Smyrn. c. 7. See more of this Chap. vii.

St. Cyprian * represents Schism as of so horrid a Nature, that Martyrdom could not atone the Guilt thereof: Of whose Thoughts see more Chap. x. † I might refer the Reader to what some Dissenters themselves have said, particularly Dr. Bryan, in his *Dwelling with God*, p. 304, &c. And Mr. Baxter, as elsewhere, so in his *Christian Directory*, p. 739, &c. Where he represents "Divisions as Deformities of the Church, the Lamentation of Friends, and the Scorn of Enemies; the Dishonour of Christ and the Gospel; the great Hindrance of the Conversion and Salvation of the World, and of the Edification of the Church; that they fill the Church with Sins of a most odious Nature; they cherish Pride and Malice, and belying others, (the three great Sins of the Devil) as naturally as dead Flesh breedeth Worms." After, "They are uneasy to the Persons themselves, and rob them of the sweetest part of Religion; they lead directly to Apostacy from the Faith, and shake States and Kingdoms, having a lamentable Influence on the Civil Peace." And then, p. 741. "Schism is a Sin against so many, and clear, and vehement Words of the Holy Ghost, that it is ut-

* De Unit. Eccles.

† So also Dionysius of Alex. Euseb. H. Eccl. l. 6. c. 45.

xxxvi Preliminary Dissertation.

“terly without Excuse: Whoredoms, and Treason,
“and Perjury, are not oftner forbidden in the Go-
“spel than this. It is contrary to the very Design
“of Christ in our Redemption, which was to re-
“concile us all to God, and to unite and centre us
“all in him. It is a Sin against the nearest Bonds
“of our highest Relations to each other. — Lastly,
“it is most unlike the heavenly State, and in some
“regard worse than the Kingdom of the Devil,
“for he would not destroy it by dividing it against
“itself.” Read there much more to the same
purpose.

But besides, I desire the Christian Reader to con-
sider how much those who separate from Commu-
nion with their Bishops, are Enemies to their own
Souls, when they neglect the Means of their Salva-
tion? There’s no other way of obtaining Salvation,
but thro’ *Christ* our Saviour: No way of obtaining
the Benefits of his Purchase, such as Pardon, San-
ctification, &c. but in the use of those *Ordinances*
which he has instituted to that End. Those *Ordi-
nances* are *Baptism*, by which we put on Christ, are
ingrafted into him the true Vine, made Members
of his mystical Body. And also the *Lord’s Supper*,
wherein we feed on the Sacrifice of Christ’s Body
and Blood, and partake of the Benefits of his Pas-
sion. These cannot be duly administred, but by
such who are *Christ’s Ministers*, Persons commissioned
by him; for ’tis in vain to expect that Christ should
ratify that in Heaven, which is done here on Earth
without his Authority. None are such Ministers,
but those who are rightly and *duly ordained* to that
sacred Office. None are such, but they who derive
their Authority in a *Succession* from the Apostles.
This has all along been transmitted by the Imposi-
tion of the Hands of *Bishops*; the first of whom
were appointed by the blessed Apostles, and others
have all along received Authority from them in a
continued

Preliminary Dissertation. xxxvii

continued Succession. The Presbyters ordained by these Bishops receive Authority to administer the Holy Sacraments, and the like solemn Ministrations, but have no Power conferred on them to ordain others to the sacred Office. Consequently, as we have ground to expect the Benefits conferred on the Sacraments, when administered by Bishops, and those Presbyters that are ordained by Bishops, so we have no ground to expect the same from others who are not thus ordained, in that they have no Power from Christ to administer those Ordinances. Now when it is evident, that those who are ordained by Bishops are rightful Ministers of Christ, as deriving their Authority in a continued Succession from the Apostles; and consequently, that their Ministrations are valid, and such as we have Reason to believe that Christ will ratify in Heaven; are not those Enemies to their own Souls, who forsake their Communion, and join in Assemblies opposite to 'em; nay, with a Party that are professed Enemies to Episcopacy itself? I earnestly desire them to consider whether they have any ground to expect those great Blessings of Pardon, Reconciliation with God, Adoption, the Holy Spirit to renew and sanctify them; and the Gift of Eternal Life which all serious Christians chiefly desire to obtain; when they forsake the Communion of such, from whose Ministry alone they have true ground to hope for the Conveyance of these Benefits to themselves.

This is a thing of the highest Moment and Importance, as that upon which Mens Eternal Happiness depends, and consequently ought not to be slighted, but deserves to be considered with their intensest Thoughts and maturest Deliberation; which, as it excites my Zeal and Pity, so I heartily wish it may move Dissenters to consider with the greatest Seriousness and Application, to their present Com-

xxxviii *Preliminary Dissertation.*

Comfort and future Happiness: And especially their Leaders and Teachers, who incur a greater Guilt, whilst they draw others into the Sin of Schism, or at least cause them to persist therein securely by their Doctrine and Example. This is properly scandalizing others. I earnestly beg of them seriously to ponder what our Saviour has denounced against such, *Luk. xvii. 1, 2.* And withal, how great a Sin it is to intrude into the sacred Office without a Divine Commission, when God so severely punished this in *Uzza* and *Uzziab.* This I am the more encouraged to propound, in that some worthy conscientious Men among them have, upon sight of their Error, returned to the Communion of our Church. This makes me not despair of the Conversion of others, and their following such good Examples, if they could be prevailed with maturely to consider of how great Importance this Affair is, as that in which their own and others Comfort and Happiness is so nearly concerned. Besides, the Honour of God, the Interest of Religion, the Peace of the Church, and its Security from its Enemies, which is preserved by the Union of its Members. If hence they would be induced impartially to consider the Constitution of our establish'd Church, and on what firm Foundations it is settled; that its Government by Bishops is that by which the whole Church of God has been governed ever since the Apostles, and consequently that Separation from such a Church, unless it imposes sinful Terms of Communion, which cannot be truly alledg'd in this Case, is unjustifiable. That by the Imposition of Bishops Hands Christ's Ministers have been always consecrated to that sacred Office, and consequently that without this, their Call is null, and the Exercise thereof both invalid, and an Usurpation. I say, a thorough Consideration of these things might, by God's Blessing, awaken them from

Preliminary Dissertation. xxxix

from their secure Continuance in Schism, and prevail with them to endeavour to undeceive their Hearers, by their uniting themselves to our Communion, and giving their Reasons for so doing; by which they'll evidence the Truth of their Repentance for their former Errors to the World, as well as to their own Consciences.

I might have here considered some poor Refuges on which some well-meaning but unthinking Persons trust, to the deluding their own Souls; especially the Examples of others. There are, say they, many good Christians, Persons of great Piety and Sobriety, such who we believe desire to please God and save their own Souls, that separate from the Church of *England*, as well as we; nay, many of our Teachers, that keep us in this way, are Men of great Piety and Zeal for God and Religion, and may not we unsafely follow the Example of the former, and the Example and Instructions of the latter?

I would have such consider, that God hath made his own revealed Will, and not the Examples of any mere Men, the Rule of our Practice; that he has in the holy Scriptures recorded the Failings of his Servants, yea of eminent Saints, that we might not make their Lives and Actions our Standards. We know that *Satan* himself appears as an *Angel of Light*; that many *Hereticks* have appeared in the Disguise of singular Sanctity; that many *Papists* and Priests of the Church of *Rome*, and especially their *Monks*, are Men of strict Lives; that *Quakers* have been eminent for their exact Justice in their Dealings; that even some *Heathens*, such as *Socrates*, *Epictetus*, and *Antoninus* have transcended Multitudes of Christians in their virtuous Behaviour. And yet no considerate Christians think it safe to make these Men their Guides, or to embrace their Religion, because they transcend others in some Excellencies.

But

xl *Preliminary Dissertation.*

But this I shall not here prosecute, having spoken to it in my *Persuasive to Reformation and Union*, published thirty Years since; nor to their Pretences of greater Edification, their profiting most by the Sermons of Non-Conformists, and some other things there handled, but more fully by the Cases of the *London Divines*, which are well abridged by the worthy Mr. *Bennet*. As also, that the Church of *England* imposes no unlawful Conditions of Communion, (the only just Plea, if it could be made out, of Separation) which the same well-deserving learned Person has more largely handled in his Book of *Schism*; as also the Reverend Dr. *E. Wells*, in his Tracts.

I might have represented to them, who are confirmed in their Schism by the Example of others, the Example of the old *Non-Conformists*, who, tho' they disliked some Ceremonies of our Church, yet declared it a great Sin to separate from our Parish-Churches, and condemned the *Brownists* or *Barrowists* for their Separation; particularly Mr. *Hilder sham* and Mr. *John Ball*. But of this, and of the Rise and Progress of Separation, the Reader may find a full historical Account in the learned Bishop *Stillingsfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*, Part I. And how zealously many other of the old *Non-Conformists* withstood the Separatists; as in the other Parts he answers the *Pleas* for Separation. This latter has lately been very well done by Mr. *William Robertson*, in his Answer to Mr. *Delaun*, entitled, *Dissenters Self-condemned*.

There was one Argument that I propounded in my forementioned Tract, to dissuade serious Christians from Separation, and especially when they were moved thereto, on Apprehension of purer Administrations, greater Means of Edification, affectionate Preaching, or the like, to be had in other Parties or Churches. This is the Danger these
Men

Men are liable to, of running from one Party to another, till they terminate in Atheism; unnecessary Breaches leading to downright Irreligion. This appeared from Instances of some, during the licentious Liberty in the time of the late Rebellion, who at first became *Presbyterians* on account of greater Reformation; and after, on the like Reasoning, turned *Independents*; these pretending to greater Sanctity. Afterwards, when they saw the *Anabaptists* refine on them, followed these; at length, on the like Motives, closed with the *Quakers*, and some with the *Ranters*. Others went over to the Church of *Rome*, and too many had their Religion to *seek*, or became downright *Scepticks* or *Atheists*. Give me leave here to express the same Argument in the Words of Dr. *Scot* in his *Christian Life*, Part. I. ch. 4. §. 5. Where the Reader may find this Subject excellently handled, and the ill Fruits of Schism represented. (1.) As it sow's Mens Tempers, renders them peevish, and destroys Charity, the leading Vertue of our Religion. (2.) And as it leads to the foulest Hypocrisies, in that while they misemploy their Zeal about little Trifles, streining at Gnats, they swallow Camels, and glibly digest the greatest Immoralities. So also, (3.) "Schisms naturally lead to downright *Irreligion*. For when once a Man departeth from an established Church without a just Warrant, there is nothing that can confine or set Shores to him; he hath no Principles that can stay him any where, or set any Measures of changing to him. For when upon a mere *Humour* or *Fancy* he hath run from the Church to such a Sect, what should hinder him from running from that Sect to another, till he hath run himself out of all Religion? He is rolling down a steep Hill, and hath no Principles to stay him, so that 'tis impossible to determine *whither* he will go, or *where* he

" he will *stop*. He may perhaps stay at such an O-
 " pinion; but if he doth, it is by *chance*; and if
 " he doth not, he will be endlessly rolling from
 " one Opinion to another, and shifting his Church
 " as oft as his Almanack. For Schism is a large
 " *Labyrinth*, that naturally divides and subdivides
 " into infinite Paths and Allies, wherein a Man
 " may wander to Eternity, and the farther he goes
 " the more he may lose himself; and then when
 " he hath wandered a while out of one wild Opi-
 " nion to another, and still perceives that the far-
 " ther he goes the more he is dissatisfyed, 'tis a
 " thousand to one if he doth not at last *suspect* and
 " *question* all Religion, as if the whole were an in-
 " tricate Maze of absurd and doubtful Opinions,
 " contrived on purpose to amuse Mens Minds, and
 " entangle them in endless Perplexities. For the
 " Schismatick doth commonly place a great part
 " of his Religion in that Opinion upon which he
 " divides and separates; so that if once he be dis-
 " satisfyed with this, as in all Probability he will
 " quickly be, having begun already to ring Chan-
 " ges, he will be under a great Temptation to
 " mistrust the *whole* Religion to be as great an Im-
 " posture as he finds this *darling Opinion* is; espe-
 " cially after he hath run thro' several Sets of O-
 " pinions, and finds them at last to be all *Delusi-*
 " *ons*.—Upon this Account therefore, I make no
 " doubt but that the Atheism of this present Age
 " is very much owing to its *Sects* and *Divisions*.
 The other part of that *Section* is worth the perusal,
 wherein that excellent Author shews the Sinfulness
 and Danger of Schism; that nothing can excuse se-
 parating from our Ecclesiastical Superiors, but their
 imposing *sinful Conditions* of Communion; that we
 ought not to condemn them as such, before we have
 used the utmost Diligence in examining what is to
 be said *for*, as well as *against* them, and have propo-
 sed

fed our Doubts to our spiritual Pastors; that if we are not *able* to judge, or do only *doubt* of their Lawfulness, 'tis safest, nay 'tis our Duty to submit to the Churches Judgment and Authority; and that we ought not to separate, till upon an impartial Enquiry into the Reasons on both sides, we are fully convinced that they are unlawful.

I shall conclude with repeating my affectionate earnest Entreaties to all conscientious Christians, as they tender the Honour of God, the Interest of Religion, the Prosperity of the Church, the Peace and Welfare of these Nations, (which every good Man ought to be concerned for) and their own present Comfort and future Happiness, (which every one, especially every good Christian, cannot but be concerned for,) seriously to consider what I have here propounded. I would beg of them in the Name of the God of Love, and the Prince of Peace, that they would *follow after Peace*, especially Peace with the Church of God, and hereby approve themselves Christians, by making Conscience of this Christian Duty which is so often inculcated in the Gospel; that they would (as bidden 1 *Theff.* iv. 11. φιλοημεῖσθε ἑαυτοὺς) be *ambitious*, to be *peaceable* themselves, and to promote this Christian Temper in others; that they would (αὐτοδυνάμεις, *Eph.* iv. 3.) use their greatest Endeavours, their utmost Study and Industry to *preserve the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*. But I'll shut up all in the pathetic Words of the Apostle, *Phil.* ii. 1. *If there be therefore any Consolation in Christ, if any Comfort of Love, if any Fellowship of the Spirit, if any Bowels and Mercies, fulfil ye my Joy, and the Joy of every pious Christian, that ye be like-minded, having the same Love, being of one accord, of one mind.*

P O S T S C R I P T.

HAVING in this previous Discourse, and in the History itself, had a chief Regard to what *D. Blondel* had written against Episcopacy, his Book being the great Armory from which other Adversaries have borrowed their Weapons, I think it not amiss here to subjoin a Letter written by *Dr. P. du Moulin*, and publish'd by *Dr. Durell* (to whom it was written) in the *Appendix* to his *View of the Government and publick Worship of God, in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas*, p. 339, 340. and since by *Mr. Bennet*; in that it discovers the free Judgment and inward Thoughts of that learned Person, and shews how little he was a Friend to them, who living in a Church and Nation in which Bishops are, and have all along (but in time of Rebellion and Confusion) been settled, dare oppose that establish'd Government; and how he would much less have favour'd and countenanc'd those, who schismatically separate from such a Church, and rend it in Pieces by their unchristian Divisions, to the Breach of its Unity, Disturbance of its Peace, and the Hurt of their own Souls. If these Men will have a Regard to this Person, while pleading as an *Advocate*, (tho' unconclusively, as is here shewn) in a Cause which he had undertaken, ought they not to have a greater Regard to him, when he sedately declares his Mind as a *Judge*, and calmly and deliberately gives his Advice as a *Friend*. Especially when he (after all his former Performance) owns Episcopal Pre-eminence to be an ancient and *Apostolical* Constitution. I earnestly beseech the conscientious Reader seriously to consider this, together with that which I have already recommended

commended to his Thoughts, as he values his own inward Peace, the Peace of Christ's Church, the Interest of Religion, and the Honour of Almighty God.

The LETTER is as follows.

"My Reverend Bräther,

"To cast my Mite into the rich Treasury, which you are now furnishing, I must inform you of a remarkable Passage very pertinent to your Purpose. In the Year 1651, that great and good Man, my Lord Primate *Usher*, told me, that the learned Mr. *David Blondel* had concluded his *Apologia pro Hieronymo* with Words to this Purpose, By all that we have said to assert the Rights of the Presbytery, we do not intend to invalidate the Ancient and Apostolick Constitution of Episcopal Preeminence. But we believe that wheresoever it is established conformably to the ancient Canons, it must be carefully preserved, and wheresoever by some Heat of Contention, or otherwise, it has been put down, or violated, it ought to be reverently restored. The good Primate told me besides, that whereas the Book had been written at the earnest Request of the Assembly of *Westminster*, of the Scots especially, who had their Agents and Leaders in *Paris*, to strengthen their Party by misinforming the Protestants of *France*, and winning them to their Side. When these Agents saw this Conclusion of Mr. *Blondel's* Manuscript, they expostulated with him very loud, for marring all the Good he had done in his Book, disappointing the Expectation of the Assembly, and shewing himself an Enemy, instead of a Friend, to their holy Covenant. This they urged upon him with such Vehemency, and unwearied Importunity, that they prevailed with him to put out that

xlvi *Preliminary Dissertation.*

“ Conclusion. Having received this Information,
“ from a Person of so much Knowledge and Inte-
“ grity, as that famous Prelate, yet for a farther
“ Confirmation I told it to Mr. *John Blondel*, (*Da-*
“ *vid's* Brother) then living in *London*, who de-
“ nyed that there was any Truth in that Report,
“ and defended his Brother, as much wronged by
“ it. If you think (said I) that I wrong your Bro-
“ ther, complain to him of me in your next Let-
“ ter, and remember my kind Service to him.
“ Mr. *John Blondel* did not fail to write to his
“ Brother about this; and three or four Weeks af-
“ ter shew'd me a Letter from him, wherein he
“ remembred his Love to me, and acknowledged
“ that that Relation was true.

“ This Advice I thought my self obliged to
“ give you, knowing that no Man can make a bet-
“ tet use of it than your self, to whose holy La-
“ bours about this Point the Church is so much
“ indebted; and none more your Debtor in the
“ Church, in that Regard, than,

“ SIR,

“ *Your most affectionate Brother and Servant,*

PETER DU MOULIN.

THE

The CONTENTS

THE
CONTENTS
OF THE
PRELIMINARY DISSERTATION.

THE Peace and Welfare of the Church of the highest Moment, p. i. Its Enemies to be withstood, *ibid.* As Atheists, so Separatists from it, p. ii. Against whose Writings An History of the Primitive Government of the Church useful, p. iii. Separatists from their Bishop are Enemies to themselves, and here without Excuse, p. iv. The two great Pretences of our Adversaries: (1) That Bishops and Presbyters are the same Office; and (2) That a Bishop's Charge should not exceed that of a single Congregation, obviated in the History, p. vi. Some Arguments for the first, here considered, *ibid.* That the Institution of Bishops is not delivered in the History of the New Testament, *ibid.* This might be pleaded against the Lord's Day, p. vii. Especially when Bishops were not settled till after the History of the New Testament ended, *ibid.* Revelations gradually made to the Apostles, p. viii. The Sufficiency of the holy Scriptures not hence prejudiced, p. ix. The Government by Bishops evidenced by Christ's Designation, the Apostles Practice, and the Settlement thereof in the seven Churches of Asia; all delivered in holy Scripture, p. x. The Opinion, that Bishops were not introduced till thirty five Years after the Apostles, has no Foundation, p. xii. Polycarp and Ignatius Bishops before

The CONTENTS.

that time, *ibid.* Blondel's *Arguments against Episcopacy considered*, p. xiv. (1) *From the promiscuous use of Episcopus and Presbyter in the New Testament*, *ibid.* At that time no Bishops in particular Churches, because the Apostles governed, *ibid.* Words denoting Offices variously used, *Imperator, Cæsar, Presbyter, Episcopus*, p. xv. (2) *Because both Bishops and Presbyters are stiled Sacerdotes*, p. xviii. In the Jewish Church both High Priest and the Inferior thus called, yet distinct Offices, *ibid.* So in the Christian Church, p. xix. St. Cyprian's Words in this Case, p. xxi. He no Friend to Presbyterian Parity, *ibid.* (3) *Bishops called Presbyters in the first Age*, p. xxii. Only as it signified old Men in Papias and Irenæus, p. xxiii. (4) *Bishops and Presbyters required to perform the same Duties*, p. xxiv. Many the same, yet some are peculiar to Bishops, p. xxv. Ignatius speaks honourably of the Office of Presbyters, yet makes these subject to Bishops, *ibid.* (5) Blondel asserts that Synods raised Bishops to their supereminent Power, and depressed Presbyters, p. xxvi. That thence the Difference is of human Institution, p. xxvii. Yet he can give no Instance of Presbyters exercising Acts of supreme Authority in the Church, such as Ordaining, *ibid.* A Passage in the second Council of Seville considered, *ibid.* The Suggestion that Episcopacy is Popish, answered, p. xxxi. The Challenge renewed, that N. C.'s would find but one Church that hath not been ordered by Episcopal Government, p. xxxiii. A Persuasive to Dissenters to return to the Communion of our established Church, lest they continue in the Guilt of Schism, p. xxxiv. The Mischief of which evinced from Scripture, Fathers, and Mr. Baxter, *ibid.* And lest they become their own Enemies by depriving themselves of the Benefits of the Gospel, which they cannot reasonably expect in a State of Separation, p. xxxvi.

C O N T

The CONTENTS

CONTENTS

OF THE

HISTORY.

THE INTRODUCTION. *The Difficulty of this Work from the Scarcity of Monuments, p. 1. Its Usefulness, p. 4.*

CHAP. I.

The Government of the Church during Christ's abode on Earth.

Christ the Sovereign of this Society, p. 5. *His Dominion extensive, chiefly over loyal Subjects, who were numerous during his abode here, p. 6. The Officers of his Kingdom; the Superior, the 12 Apostles, and the Inferior, the Seventy, p. 7. These distinct Offices, p. 9. The last not temporary, p. 12. This a Platform for Disparity of Officers in the Church, p. 13. The Commission given to the Apostles, Matth. 28. 18, 19, 20. Joh. 20. 21. p. 16.*

CHAP. II.

Of the Government of the Church under the Apostles.

The Apostles to be 12, p. 21. Matthias chose by divine Designation, p. 22. The Apostles invested by the Unction of the Holy Ghost Acts ii, ibid. This a Testimony to their Mission, and a Help in their Work, p. 23. The Church of Jerusalem many Congregations, but one Church, p. 25. Deacons ordained by the Apostles; what share the People had in their Choice; what the Office of Deacons, p. 27. The Apostles reside at Jerusalem jointly to govern the Church, p. 28. Send Peter and John to Samaria to perfect what Philip could not effect,

The CONTENTS.

effect, p. 29. *The Holy Ghost given by the Imposition of their Hands, ibid. Confirmation hence deduced by the Fathers, ibid.*

C H A P. III.

Of the Ministers who officiated in the first Christian Assemblies.

*The Necessity of some to celebrate solemn Offices in such Assemblies, p. 31. Extraordinary Gifts fitted the first Christians for such Ministeries, and seem to give them a Call thereto, till proper Offices were instituted, p. 32. They preached the Word, and probably baptized, and consecrated the Eucharist, ibid. This no Warrant for any to do so now, unless they can prove their Call by the like Testimonials, p. 33. No Conclusion can be made for standing Officers in the Church from St. Paul's enumeration of them who had received Spiritual Gifts, p. 34. Presbyters instituted, p. 36. In things of this kind the Apostles proceeded gradually, according to the Revelations they received, and the Churches Necessities, p. 37. Thus in receiving uncircumcised Persons into the Christian peculium, p. 38. Presbyters acted under the Apostles, p. 39. What were Elders in the Jewish, and answerably in the Christian Church, ibid. The Names given to Christian Presbyters in the New Testament, *ἐπιστάται, ἐπισκοποι*; chosen out of the *ἀρχαὶ*, or first Converts, ibid.*

C H A P. IV.

Of St. James made Bishop of Jerusalem. No Bishops at first in other Churches.

The Continuance of the Apostles at Jerusalem, p. 42. A Tradition that they had a divine Command to do so for 12 Years, p. 43. After which they dispersed to propagate the Gospel, ibid. Before their Dispersion they constitute St. James Bishop of Jerusalem, p. 44. This testified by the universal Consent of the Ancients, and agreeable to the holy Scripture, p. 45. The Government settled in the Mother Church a Precedent for modelling other Churches,

The CONTENTS.

Churches, p. 48. This Church vastly larger than a single Congregation, ibid. In other Churches no Bishops at first being under the Government of the Apostles, and chiefly under the Founders thereof, p. 49. The large Extents of the Apostles Power, ibid. Some parts of which they commit to Presbyters, p. 52. But not to ordain, Acts xiii. 1, 2, 3. considered, p. 53. Nor to enact Decrees, Acts xv. considered, p. 54. No Bishops being placed in particular Churches while the Apostles governed them hurts not the Cause of Episcopacy, but shews the Vanity of confining a Bishop to a single Congregation, p. 56.

CHAP. V.

Of the Government of the Church towards the latter end of the Lives of the Apostles.

Apostolick Power of large Extent committed to Timothy, to ordain, to censure, even Presbyters, and to take Care of the Clergys Maintenance, p. 58. So to Titus, p. 60. The power to ordain never given to Presbyters in the Instructions given to Tim. and Titus, p. 61. Probably these might not reside in a fixed station, ibid. Others intrusted with the like power, p. 62. Diotrophes, p. 63. His abuse of his Power no argument against the Office, ibid. St. Clement's attestation of the Subordination of Officers in the Christian Church, answerable to what was in the Jewish, p. 64. The Method for a Continuation of Christ's Ministers, p. 68. Blondel's Objection against Bishops from the Inscription of Clement's Epistle considered, p. 69. Bishops Successors of the Apostles, p. 72. Their extraordinary Gifts, nor Unfixedness no Argument to the contrary, p. 73.

CHAP. VI.

Bishops fixed in particular Churches at the end of the Apostles Days. The Angels, Rev. ii. 3.

*By Angels single persons must be meant, and such to whom the Government of those Churches was committed being commended for the right Management of it, and
reproved*

The CONTENTS.

reproved for not executing of Discipline, p. 74. In which neither Presbyters or Laity are concerned, p. 77. To whom Christ directs Epistles; called Stars, Angels, ibid. Bishops early in those Churches, p. 77. All Churches then under Bishops, p. 78. Irenæus's Testimony of Polycarp's being made Bishop by the Apostles, ibid. Appeals to Successions of Bishops from the Apostles, particularly at Rome, p. 81. Of which Clement was one, (mentioned Phil. iv. 3) ibid. To whom Hermas testifies God sent a Message, p. 82. The Succession of Bishops at Jerusalem, p. 85.

C H A P. VII.

Of the Church at Antioch; its Bishop Ignatius, and his asserting the supreme Authority of Bishops in the Church.

Of the Church of Antioch, p. 87. Its first Bishops Euodius and Ignatius, p. 88. His Epistles genuine, as of late published, p. 89. The Testimony they give to the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, p. 90. That Presbyters derive their Authority from them, p. 100. Bishops of divine Institution, ibid. Subjection to 'em, and Union with 'em, necessary, and a means of being secured from Hereticks, p. 101. His Appeal for the Truth of these things to a particular Revelation, ibid. An Application to Dissenters, p. 102. An Objection against Bishops, out of Polycarp's Epistle, answered, p. 103. Their Superiority evident from that Epistle, p. 104.

C H A P. VIII.

Bishops in the Churches of Asia known from their meeting in Synods, and their Epistles, (as also in Europe,) and from their Appeals to the Succession of Bishops.

No History of the Bishops of many Churches, because we have no notice of the Churches themselves, p. 105. The Account of Bishops met in Synods, p. 106. In opposing the Montanists, ibid. About the Paschal Controversy, p. 107. So from Epistles, ibid. These chiefly shew

The CONTENTS.

shew Bishops in Asia, particularly at Ephesus, ibid. Concerning the Censure of Noetus by the Presbyters of Ephesus, p. 108. Provincial Synods consisted of Bishops, p. 109. Bishops at Antioch, at Jerusalem, and other Churches in Palestine, as Cæsarea, &c. ibid. Proved farther from the Council against Paulus Samosat. p. 111. The Vanity of Congregational Episcopacy evinced from the small Number of Bishops in that Council from many Countries, p. 112. Bishops in Europe, in Greece and Crete, ibid. Bishops were settled in many Churches by the Apostles, proved by Appeals made to the Successions of Bishops in those Churches, for the Truth of Doctrines, p. 113. By Hegesippus, p. 114. Irenæus (who is shewn to have been first Presbyter, then Bishop of Lyons) mentions the Succession of the Bishops of Rome, p. 115. So by Tertullian, p. 117. The ground of these Fathers Reasoning, p. 118. The Apologists had little occasion to mention the Government of the Christian Churches, ibid. Justin Martyr's witnesses, p. 119. Tertullian's Seniores and Presidentes, p. 120. The weight of the Fathers Testimonies for Bishops, from their Ability and Opportunity of knowing, and from their Integrity. p. 122.

C H A P. IX.

The planting of Churches in Egypt, their Succession of Bishops there, with the Judgment of the Fathers of those Churches, concerning the Authority of Bishops.

'Tis a wonder that we have so slender an account of the planting of the Churches in Egypt, where were so many Jews, and of Essens, so much disposed to embrace Christianity, p. 124. The planting of the Church of Alexandria by St. Mark, and the Succession of Bishops there, p. 125. Owned by St. Jerom, p. 126. Of Eutychius, p. 127. Clem. Alex's Testimony for Bishops superior to Presbyters, p. 128. Also Origen's, p. 131. The large Extent of the Church of Alexandria shewn from him, and Dionysius Alex. p. 132. His Testimony for the Bishops in other Churches in Egypt, p. 134.
This

The CONTENTS.

This also shewn from Melitius's actings, and the Council of Nice's Decree against him, p. 135. Ischyrras's Ordination judged invalid, because the Person who ordained him was not a true Bishop, p. 138. Leo's Determination concerning counterfeit Bishops ordaining in Gallia Narbonensis considered, p. 139. Bishops settled, not only in Egypt, but in all Churches, proved from the Nicene Councils, Can. 6. p. 141. From the Council of Arles, p. 143. And from Athanasius, p. 144.

C H A P. X.

Of Bishops at Carthage, and the adjoining Territories.

*No mention of the Church of Carthage till the beginning of the 3^d Century from Tertullian, p. 147. From whom we know it then to be very large, p. 148. Its Founder not known; probably from Rome. Tho' Tertullian names no Bishop of Carthage, yet from him we may be assured there were Bishops there, when he speaks of Bishops, as settled in all Churches, and of their Authority, p. 149. Optatus (in Aët. Perpet. & Felicet.) Bishop of Carthage, superior to Presbyters, p. 151. Also Agrippinus, p. 152. Donatus, p. 153. And then St. Cyprian, *ibid.* His Testimony that the Churches in Africa were governed by Bishops, p. 154. In enumerating the Officers of the Church, he mentions Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, as distinct Officers, p. 155. This Subordination of these Officers was throughout the whole World, and that there was no Christian Church that was not under a Bishop, p. 158. That the Bishop was the supreme Church-Officer in his District, who confirmed reconciled Penitents, (for usurping of which Power he reproves Presbyters and Confessors) ordained, censured Offenders, p. 159. He deputed two Bishops to do this in his Retirement, p. 161. The Necessity of Bishops owned by Schismatics themselves, especially in respect to Ordination, *ibid.* Novatus did not ordain Felicissimus, p. 162. A Bishop not accountable to any other Bishop, much less to his own People or Clergy, p. 163. The Bishop was the Principle of Unity, *ibid.* Communicatory Letters written by Bishops, p. 164. Great Affairs of the Church determined*

The CONTENTS.

determined by Bishops met in Synods, p. 165. And when they could not thus meet, by Epistles, p. 167. The Bishops were a College, p. 168. None of them owned Presbyters as their Collegues, p. 169. Bishops then owned to have their Power from Christ, and to be Successors of the Apostles, by St. Cypr. and Firmilian, ibid. Bishops Districts then not confined to a single Congregation, p. 171. One City, tho' never so large, had but one Bishop, p. 172. Ordinances not esteem'd valid, from them who separated from the true Bishops, p. 173. Bishops then in France and Spain, p. 179.

C H A P. XI.

Bishops in Spain, France, Britain, &c. of Acrius.

Spain probably received the Gospel from St. Paul, however early, p. 179. No particular account of Churches there till the time of St. Cyprian, p. 180. And then of their Bishops, p. 181. After at the Councils of Eliberis, of Arles. ibid. The Gospel early entertain'd in France, p. 182. Bishops there before the Year 170, ibid. When Pothinus was martyred, ibid. At the Council of Arles, p. 183. Britain received the Gospel early, ibid. Bishops from thence at Arles, as from other Countries, p. 185. Bishops early in Italy, Thrace, &c. in Syria, Palestine, at Jerusalem and Cæsarea, p. 186. The Testimony of Eusebius Bishop of that City, for the Apostles setting Bishops in Churches, and there being universally received together with the Christian Faith, p. 187. Of Acrius, p. 189. His equalling Presbyters with Bishops condemned as heretical, ibid.

C H A P. XII.

Of Tradition concerning the Church of Scotland being governed by Monks and Presbyters, without Bishops. Of the Abbot of Hy. Of the Guldees.

Fordon, the Author of that Story, too late to be a Witness, p. 191. The Story improbable, ibid. No Christians among the Scots in Ireland before Palladius, p. 192.

The CONTENTS.

p. 192. *That Tradition of any before, names their Bishops, ibid. The same Government of the Church in North Britain as in South Britain, ibid. This by Bishops, ibid. St. Patrick the Converter of the Scots, a Bishop, ibid. These under, before and after their coming into this Island, p. 193. Thus the Priests, ibid. Of St. Columba, p. 194. His founding a Monastery in the Isle of Hy, ibid. He being only a Presbyter invested the Abbat with a particular Power, to be superior to the Bishop, ibid. He owned the superiority of the Office of a Bishop above that of a Presbyter, p. 195. And the Necessity of that Office, taking care to have a Bishop resident in the Monastery, ibid. Of the Ordination of Finan, p. 196. A Resemblance betwixt Hy and the University of Oxford, In the first the Abbat, in the latter the Vicechancellor superior to the Bishop, p. 198. Of the Culdees, p. 199. Not mentioned till Giraldus Cambrensis in the 13th Century, ibid. Hector's Account of them ridiculous, before Monks known, ibid. Not belonging to Hy, but St. Andrews, p. 200.*

C H A P. XIII.

Of the Chorepiscopi.

*The first mention of them in the Councils of Ancyra and Neocæsarea, p. 201. Mr. Dodwell's Sense of the Canons of those Councils concerning them, ibid. The Difference of Cities and Regions, p. 203. Bishops placed in Cities, ibid. Chorepiscopi placed in Regions, subject and assistant to the City Bishop, ibid. The Council of Antioch permits them to send Communicatory Letters, p. 206. Otherwise restrains their Power, ibid. Their Office intimated in St. Basil's Epistle to 'em, p. 207. One part whereof was their Testimony of Persons to be ordained, ibid. They subscribed as definientes in Councils, ibid. Their Office was Episcopal, and had Power of Ordination, p. 208. The Council of Laodicea forbade the ordaining any more Chorepiscopi, but instead of them appointed *ἐποδιδάκτας*, p. 210. The Office of these Itinerants revived,*

The CONTENTS.

ved, having been in the Apostles and in Ignatius's time, p. 211. *Θεοπροβύται, Δεόδομοι*, cursus publicus, p. 213. The Employment of these, *ibid.* In St. Cyprian's time, p. 213. Continued to the time of the Council of Chalcedon, *ibid.* The Chorepiscopi of no Service to the Enemies of Diocesan Bishops, *ibid.* Dioceses have been divided, and new Sees erected, p. 214. A Persuasive to the Enemies of Diocesans, to lay aside their Prejudices, p. 215. *ibid.*

C H A P. XIV.

St. Jerom's Opinion of the Introduction of Bishops considered. What Pseudo-Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c. say in this Cause. The Custom of naming a Bishop at Alexandria

The Reason for considering this, p. 216. The famous Passage of St. Jerom recited, p. 217. It may well be understood of the Times of the Apostles themselves, p. 218. The Sense put on them by our Adversaries, p. 219. This considered, *ibid.* The Occasion of St. Jerom's writing this; his opposing the Deacon's Insolence against Presbyters, *ibid.* He too late to be a Witness of the Fact, p. 220. Tells us not the Time, Place, &c. when the supposed Decree was made, and how so easily submitted to, p. 221. Seditious Presbyters never mentioned this supposed original Equality with Bishops, *ibid.* This contrary to what the First Writers tell us, p. 222. The ground of St. Jerom's Opinion, the Ambiguity of the Words Episcopus and Presbyter in the New Testament, p. 223. How it fails, *ibid.* This inconsistent with St. Jerom's owning Bishops in times before this supposed Decree, *ibid.* With his making Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons distinct Offices, p. 224. The Deference due to Bishops, p. 225. As also Subjection, and the Necessity of them to the Being of a Church, and to its Safety, *ibid.* He never endeavoured the Change of this Government, p. 228. How little this Opinion recommends Presbyterian Government, *ibid.* St.

The CONTENTS.

St. Jerom no Friend to Congregational Episcopacy, p. 229. None of the Fathers produced by Blondel own the Fact asserted by St. Jerom, p. 231. They lived in times when Bishops were every where settled, *ibid.* Pseudo-Ambrose's Thoughts in this Case, p. 233. Sr. Chrysostom's (others transcribed from him,) *ibid.* That Bishops and Presbyters were used promiscuously, *ibid.* So *Ανάκτορον*, p. 235. He makes them divers Offices, *ibid.* Theodoret's Thoughts in this Cause, and of the Extent of Dioceses, p. 237. Some general Considerations on the Practice of these Fathers, p. 239. The Custom of Alexandria considered, p. 243. The Conclusion.

N A

before
ent
dic
live
wh
Ap
Aft
Fou

AN
HISTORY
OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE
Primitive Church, &c.

The INTRODUCTION.

WHEN I consider the Work that I have undertaken, I am sensible of the Difficulties and Discouragements that I shall meet with; in that whoever writes an History of things transacted before his own Time, must collect them out of ancient Monuments, and if with Satisfaction to the judicious Reader, out of the Writings of those that lived in the Age wherein the Affairs were transacted; which I cannot hope for here, after the Acts of the Apostles, which end at St. Paul's arrival at Rome: After which time there have been none before the Fourth Century, who have designedly given us an

B

Histo-

2 *An History of the Government*

Historical Account of the Affairs of the Church; and of its Government; at least we are not so happy as to have them preserved to our Time, except some few Fragments, for which we are obliged to *Eusebius*. The Primitive Christians chief Care was to lead Holy Lives, and thereby to adorn their Profession, and the Doctrine of Christ, by exemplifying it in a suitable Conversation; and to suffer courageously for it, to its Honour, induced thereto from the hope of its future Rewards; and to their Master's Honour, who inspired them with such invincible Constancy: And in the mean while were little concerned in recording those their heroic Actions and Sufferings, and as little the Affairs of the Church. And as for the Governors and Pastors of the Church, from whom we might more probably expect this, they otherwise employed themselves, viz. in propagating Christianity, in converting them that were Enemies and Strangers to it, and in instructing and directing such who had embraced the Christian Faith. When Persecutions arose, they armed their Followers against Apostacy, and administered spiritual Advice to support them under their Sufferings; and if any had lapsed, those by the Terrors of the Lord they persuaded to Repentance. They wrote *Apologies* to convince their Persecutors of the Truth and Excellency of the Christian Religion, and of the Unreasonableness and Sin of them that persecuted it. And as they opposed the open Enemies, so they detected the Frauds and disappointed the Designs of secret Adversaries, who under the disguise of Friends, either corrupted the Faith by their Heresies, or disturbed the Peace and Unity of the Church by their Schisms. In a word, they were so far busied in planting, watering or fencing Christ's Vineyard, the Church; in securing it from *the wild Boar* that endeavoured to waste it, and *the wild Beast* that sought to devour it; that they seemed not to have time or leisure to transmit to
Posterity

Posterity either a History of the exemplary Lives or courageous Sufferings of their Confessors and Martyrs, but what was communicated in Epistles to neighbour Churches, to encourage them to the like Christian magnanimity by such eminent Examples; or to record the pious Labours of the Pastors of the Church, or their Succession in the particular Cities where they presided, in any Monuments written directly for that purpose, for the first three Centuries after Christ. And yet now nothing can be known concerning these things, but what we can collect out of their excellent *Apologies* for the Christian Faith; their strenuous Defences of sound Catholic Doctrine, against Heathens, Jews or Hereticks that opposed it; their pious *Epistles* to Churches or their Pastors, which were written to caution them against Hereticks and Schismaticks, to establish them in their Zeal for Truth and Unity, to comfort and support them under the Pressures which they suffered for Christ's sake, or to direct them how to act in particular Cases or difficult Occurrences. From the Writings of the Primitive Fathers on these or the like Occasions, we must collect whatever we can satisfactorily offer to the Reader in the present Subject; which manifests the difficulty of undertaking it, as *Eusebius* has in part observed, who first undertook to write an Ecclesiastical History. However, we have cause to bless God, that we have so much of those ancient Writings left, (though little in comparison of what the next Ages produced) and these of late published with greater Accuracy and Integrity, freed from Corruptions and Interpolations, with which they were at first set forth, and hence were rejected, or at least suspected, by learned Men, till they appeared, by the help of ancient Manuscripts, in their primitive and natural Simplicity: Which was the case of *St. Ignatius* his Epistles: And we have some others of great Worth as well as Antiquity, not long since published, which had been given over for lost,

4 *An History of the Government*

as that excellent Epistle of *S. Clemens* cotemporary with the Apostles, omitting that of *S. Barnabas*, as being of no use in this present Undertaking. And when together with these, we enjoy the Labours of learned Men of this and the last Age, who have so far settled the Text, cleared the Sence of those ancient Authors, and set them in a better Light, by considering the Time and Occasion of their Writings, and the like Circumstances; we may with the greater Ease understand them, and learn from them at least the Usages and Practice, and hence the Government of the Church in the Ages wherein they wrote and flourished; as well as discern, and hereby enjoy the Patterns of their signal Piety, Zeal for God, and undaunted Resolution in the Cause of Christ and his Religion.

But when I consider farther the usefulness of the Work that I now set upon, this encourages me to undertake it, when it will be helpful to undeceive some pious, though misguided Christians; to remove the Prejudices they have entertained against the Primitive and universally received Government of the Church by Bishops, to reconcile them to the Church of *England*, the best constituted Church now on Earth: and to reduce them to Unity with it, by convincing them of their Obligations thereto, and the Unjustifiableness and Danger in separating from it. Especially those, who make its being governed by Bishops the chief ground of their Separation. When it will establish others in their just deference to our Church, and their due Submission to its Government, and be a means to confirm their Convictions, (mauger all the Arguments and Methods that may be used to unsettle them) that 'tis their Duty and Privilege to persist in its Communion. When therefore it may be thus beneficial to the Souls of Men, and at the same time advance the Peace and Welfare of God's Church, and the promoting of his Glory, and that I am conscious that

these are the sincere and charitable Ends of my Undertaking; I have grounds to hope for the Blessing and Assistance of Almighty God, which is sufficient to enable me in this Work, notwithstanding the Difficulties I may encounter; and may reasonably expect that it will find a kind Acceptance from the Christian and candid Reader, who tho' he is not entertained, as in other Histories, with variety of Transactions, surprizing Events, and other things of this kind, which generally most affect and gratifie; yet among these Defects, he'll meet with that, which will be instructive, and thence useful and beneficial.

C H A P. I.

*Of the Government of the Church, during
Christ's Abode on Earth.*

THE Church, the History of whose Government I am now collecting, was not any Society of the Worshippers of the true God, either of the *Israelites* whom God chose for his *Peculium*, or any other before that time, antecedent to our Blessed Saviour's coming among us; but that, which was founded by himself when conversant on Earth, and by his holy Apostles, after his Ascension. At which time, God, who had before confined his Church to the *Israelites*, was pleased to admit, nay to summon all Mankind, *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*, to become his *Peculium*, Subjects of that Kingdom, of which *Jesus Christ* was Lord and Sovereign, he having ^a committed all Judgment and Jurisdiction unto his Son. His solemn Investiture with Supreme Authority was up-

^a *Joh. 5. 22.*

6 *An History of the Government*

on his Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven, where he continues the Head and Monarch of his Church: Yet withal, while this Church was in its first Formation, as he was the Founder thereof, so was he its Governor. *As for this end he was born*, in his Infancy was worship'd as a *King* by the *Magi*; so he was anointed as a King in his Baptism, and received the Unction of the Holy Spirit, and a solemn Attestation from Heaven of his being the *Son* of the King of Kings, that Son, on whose *Shoulders* the Government should be, as foretold, *Esai. 9. 9.* I omit those Acts of his Sovereignty against *Hell*, in baffling Satan in the Wilderness, triumphing over him on the Cross, as well as his rescuing the Gentile World from under his Dominion, afterwards, as he did the Bodies of Men, while he was on Earth, from the Possession of those unclean Spirits. And in respect to *Men*, 'tis enough for my Design, to name his acting as a *Lawgiver* in those Edicts that he gave with such Authority, *Mat. 7. 29.* and confirmed by his Miracles: His summoning the Jews to become his Subjects and to take on them his Yoke, his bewailing their obstinate Refusal, and foretelling the dreadful Consequents thereof, which about thirty seven Years after was in the most dreadful manner executed on them by the *Romans*: Passing over these, it will be sufficient to take notice how he exercised his Kingly Office towards his Loyal Subjects, how he governed them, and laid a Pattern for the Government of his Church after his Ascension. These Subjects were either the Officers of his Kingdom, or at least Probationers for Offices; or others, who were only at large Subjects of his Kingdom. Of these latter we may conclude the Number was considerable, (tho' some went back, *Joh. 6. 66, 67.*) in that we find that ^b *he made and baptized more Disciples than John*; and yet there ^c *went out to John*

^b *Joh. 4. 1.*

^c *Mat. 3. 5.*

Jerusalem and all Judaea, and all the Region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him; which Expressions denote a considerable Multitude. When they ^a tell John, that all men came to him, to whom he bore witness: When we have just Grounds to suppose, that most, if not all, of those, whom St. John baptized and were his Disciples, were Christ's Disciples, when baptized in the name of him that was to come, to whom John bare witness, and declared ^a that he himself was not the Christ, but was sent before him: And that ^a Jesus was the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; on whom he saw the Spirit descending, and the like Testimonies. When we find farther, ^a that there were above five hundred Brethren at once, by whom Christ was seen after his Resurrection, and it is probable, that most, if not all these were of Galilee, where it is generally concluded he was seen by them, and certainly their numbers in Judaea was not much inferior. So that there is no Reason to confine the first Followers of Christ to that number of an hundred and twenty, who assembled at Jerusalem to elect one in the room of the Traytor Judas, the chiefest part of these being the Eleven Apostles, the Seventy Disciples, and such who had ministred to Christ of their Substance, mentioned Luc. 8. 2, 3.

But those who fall chiefly under our Consideration, are the Officers and Ministers of Christ's Kingdom, whom he gradually trained up, instructed and fitted for those Offices; whom he first employed in lower Administrations, and afterwards in planting and governing his Church. They at first ministred to Christ as the Sons of the Prophets did to their Masters, Joshua to Moses, and Elisha to Elijah, who were their *παῖδες* and *ὑπηρέται*, Servants and Ministers, constant Attendants, and ready at hand to go on their Messages. He kept them as

^a Joh. 3. 26. ^a V. 28. ^a Joh. 1. 29, 32. ^a 1 Cor. 15. 6

such, that he might remove out of their Minds those Prejudices, which they had entertained common with the rest of the Jewish Nation, of a *Messiah* that should rescue them from the Roman Yoke, of the Permanency of their *Mosaic* Rites, &c. That he might instil into them his Heavenly Precepts, as they became capable of receiving them; prepare them for a patient Suffering of the Miseries they should afterwards conflict with; send them on Messages, which gave notice of his approaching Kingdom, and laid the Foundation of it; that they might be Eye-witnesses of his Miracles, and especially of his Resurrection, and able to attest the Truth thereof to others, as infallible and undeniable Proofs of his Divine Mission, and sufficient to convince Mankind that he was the promised Messiah.

The chief of these were the twelve Apostles, and next to them the Seventy Disciples, who tho' not of Christ's Family as the other, yet were such, whom St. Peter, one of the Twelve, calls (*Act. 1. 21.*) *ὁμιλησάντων ἡμῖν ἀνδράς ἐν παντί χρόνῳ*, Men that accompanied us, all the time that the Lord Jesus went out and in among us; beginning from the Baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us: Out of whom one was to be substituted in the room of Judas. These are generally supposed, and that with good reason, to be the Seventy, who were Ministers of Christ, tho' of a lower Order than the Twelve Apostles; one of whom, *Matthias*, was of that number, till chosen by the Divine Suffrage into a superior Order, and then was numbred with the eleven Apostles, *Act. 1. 26.*

The twelve Apostles^b were first chosen, and after sent out by Christⁱ to preach the kingdom of God, and had Power from him, as the Seal of their Commission, over all Devils, and to cure Diseases. The Choice was performed with an extraordinary solemn

^b Luk. 6. 13.

ⁱ Luk. 9. 1, 2.

Preparation ; for we find *Him* ^k not only praying, but also continuing all night in prayer ; and this before the Choice of his Apostles ; for it immediately follows, *And when it was Day, he called unto him his Disciples, and of them he chose twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, whom he named Apostles.* As the former in St. Matthew's Gospel, immediately before the Election of the Apostles, or at least, his giving them Power to work Miracles, and his sending them forth to preach, *Mat. 9. 38. Ch. 10. 1.* And it must be owned, that the choosing of the Apostles, and their being sent forth are spoken of by St. Luke as done at several times. The first *Luk. 6. 13.* the latter *Luk. 9. 1, 2.* Where he sent them to preach the Kingdom of God, and to heal Diseases, some time after he had chosen them.

Besides the Twelve Apostles, our Blessed Saviour ^l sent forth the Seventy, to whom he likewise gave the Power of working Miracles, and commanded to declare the near approaching of God's Kingdom, whom he sent out two and two, before his face, into every city and place, whither he himself would come. These, as they were distinct from, so inferior to the Twelve ; as is evident from the Name given to their Office, being only styled *Disciples*, and not *Apostles*, as we find ^m the Twelve were upon Christ's Election of them ; from their Employment, being only *Prodromi*, Forerunners, sent before the face of Christ to the Places whither he would come, to prepare the People to entertain him ; whereas the Commission to the Apostles was to preach to all the Jews. ⁿ Tho' restrained from preaching to the Gentiles and Samaritans, yet they might go to all the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Farther, we find nothing of that Solemnity in the Election of these into their Office,

^k *Luk. 6. 12, 13.*
^p *Mat. 10. 5, 6.*

^l *Luk. 10. 1, 9.*

^m *Luk. 6. 13.*

10 *An History of the Government*

as I observed there was in that of the Apostles, before which Christ *continued all night in prayer*. When some argue for the Identity of the Offices, because the Seventy, as well as the Apostles, were empower'd to work Miracles: Yet so far as I can find, there were two things in this respect appropriated to the Apostles, *viz.* that ° of *Cleansing the Lepers*, and *Raising the Dead*, neither of which are granted to the Seventy; notwithstanding what the Learned *D. Blondel* without proof ^p asserts to the contrary. Besides, (as I have already observed) out of these one was chosen to be of the Twelve Apostles, when there wanted one to make up that number, which clearly shews they were distinct Offices. How great the Authority of the *Seventy*, nay of the Apostles themselves, was, before they received a further Commission from our Saviour, I shall not undertake to determine. 'Tis enough to have shewn that the *Apostles* were a distinct and superior Order to the *Seventy*. As for the Reasons given by *Tertullian* ^q, and from him by other ancient Fathers, that this was done in allusion to the twelve Fountains at *Elim*, and the Seventy Palm Trees there, 'tis enough to name it: Tho' Types of things, which were afterwards to be accomplish'd under the Gospel, are not to be wholly rejected; when we find Historical Passages, and other things mentioned in the Old Testament, made Representations of things in Gospel times not only by the Fathers, but also frequently by *St. Paul* himself. But 'tis probable, that as our Saviour instituted several things in Conformity to Observances that were under the *Jewish State* and *Mosaic OEconomy*, he might do the same in this; that as the twelve Tribes of *Israel* were conducted by twelve Officers, who were the Heads of those Tribes, under *Moses*; so might *Christ* choose

° *Mat.* 10. 8.

^p *Apol. pro sentent. Hieron.* §. 2. C. 5.

^q *Ad.*

vers. Marcion. l. 4. c. 24.

twelve Apostles, who should under him govern his Spiritual *Israel*, he declaring ^r that they should *sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel*. And also in compliance with the *Seventy* Officers, whom (*Num. 11. 16.*) God commanded *Moses* to set over the Israelites to minister under him, might *Christ* appoint the same number to be under himself Ministers in his Spiritual Kingdom. And withal, that as our Saviour thus looked back towards the Jewish Church and State; so he might look forward on the Christian Church, in order to correct the Errors which he foresaw would in after Ages break its Peace, and disturb its Tranquillity: As 'tis observed in his Institution of his Supper, that he bid his Disciples, that they should *all drink of the Cup*; which universal Command is not given with respect to eating the Bread: That this was designedly done by him, to manifest the Unreasonableness and Absurdity of that Practice, which he foresaw should creep into the Church, of depriving the Laity of that part of the Holy Eucharist. So he might act in subordinating some Church Officers to others, in choosing the *Twelve* Apostles, who were after his departure to be Governours of his Church, and the *Seventy* as an inferior Rank under the Apostles; to shew the vanity of their Error, who in after times should make all the Ministers of Christ of equal Authority, take away the Subjection of Presbyters to Bishops, and endeavour, as much as lies in their Power, to deprive the Church of Bishops, who were settled in it by the Apostles, and have govern'd it in all Ages, and in all Parts of it, till of late, and is an Office essential to its Constitution.

As the Distinction of these two Offices, and the Subordination of the *Seventy* to the *Apostles*, plainly appears from what I have deduced out of the Holy Scriptures; so likewise 'tis evident that this was

^r *Mat. 19. 28.*

^r *Mat. 26. 27.*

the Belief of the Primitive Church. The ancient Fathers considered the Seventy as inferior to the Apostles, that (as St. Chrysostom expresses it) τὰ δὲ ἑβδομήκοντα ἐλάττωον, that they were in a second Order from the Apostles. Which when delivered by Tertullian, Clemens of Alexandria, and others, as is acknowledged by the most learned Adversaries of Episcopacy, we may safely conclude, that this was an universal Tradition derived down from the Apostles, when delivered by them who lived so near their Time; and hence not to be rejected by us, especially when so consonant to the Holy Scriptures.

I know that Dissenters, to evade the force of this Argument for a Subordination of Ministers in the Church, have objected, that the Office of the *seventy* was but Temporary; that they were only designed for that particular Employment of proclaiming the approach of Christ's Kingdom; and that it ended when they had given Him an account of their discharging their Duty, and the divine Power that accompanied them therein. But I think none can rationally persist in that Opinion, when they consider what our Saviour promises them upon their return from their first Ministry, and the success that attended them. *Luke 10. 17, 19.* when they tell him with joy, that *even the Devils were subject to them through his name*; he replies, *I give unto you Power to tread on Serpents and Scorpions, and over all the Power of the Enemy (i. e. Satan, the chief Adversary of his Kingdom) and nothing shall by any means hurt you.* In which words we have a Promise made them by Christ of new Assistance, and farther Aid in the discharge of their Office; which supposes its continuance, and their future Execution of it. Especially if we add what was before observed, that out of *these* an Apostle was elected into the place of Judas, as is generally concluded both by ancient and

* Parker's Case of the Church of England, p. 133.

mode
choo
time
As
the
ment
to be
so di
Chur
conce
on of
us,
venty
some
Barn
(λέγε
joine
as al
Judas
with
Justu
T
Apo
ther
cy, o
them
chose
the f
One
divin
imme
choic
with
obser
" the
A
+ E
x a] d
Church

modern Writers, and by St. Peter's Expression of choosing one that had *compained with them, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them.* As for the names of the seventy Disciples, which the *Pseudo-Dorotheus* and others pretend to give us, mentioned and exposed by *Blondel*, they are not to be relied on, when it is plain † *Eusebius* who was so diligent a searcher into the Monuments of the Church, and has collected as much as he could find concerning the Plantation of Churches, the Succession of Bishops, and other things of this kind, tells us, That *there was no where to be had a List of the Seventy Disciples.* Yet we may probably suppose that some of them were known in the next Age, when *Barnabas* is there mentioned by him, as reported (λαβεῖν) to be one of them; and *Softhenes*, who is joined with St. Paul in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*; as also *Matthias*, who was chosen into the place of *Judas*, and he that had the Honour to have a Lot with him, viz. *Joseph* called *Barsabas* and surnamed *Justus*.

'Tis evident, that the Eleven knew the Office of Apostles to be distinct from, and superior to all other Offices in the Church; in that upon the Vacancy, occasioned by the Death of *Judas*, they looked on themselves obliged to take care that one should be chosen into that Office. If the *Seventy* had been of the same Office, there would have been no need of One to be substituted in *Judas's* room, and that by a divine Designation; in that one of the *Seventy* might immediately have succeeded without any farther choice, had they been of the same Office and Order with the Apostles. Besides, (as an eminent Person observes) " If the *Twelve* were nothing more than the *Seventy*, and the *Seventy* nothing less than the

ⁱ Apolog. pro sent. Hieron, §. 3. c. 2, 3.

† Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 12. Τῶν ἐκδομήκοντα μαθητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων ὡς εἰς ἑκάστην φέρεται. Bishop Parker's Case of the Church of England, p. 124, 133.

" Twelve,

14 *An History of the Government*

“ *Twelve*, to what purpose do we hear so oft of the
 “ *Twelve* and the *Seventy*, or not rather of the
 “ *Eighty Two*? Hence (as the same learned Person
 “ observes) we need not dispute whether the *Missi-*
 “ *ons* of the Apostles and the *Seventy* were tempo-
 “ rary or not: But 'tis evident from hence what
 “ Model of Government our Saviour framed for his
 “ Church. — Our Saviour's Design in his Life-
 “ time seems to have been, not so much to found
 “ Churches himself, as to have prepared and in-
 “ structed his Disciples, how to do it after his de-
 “ parture. So that he rather made a *Specimen* of
 “ the Constitution of his Church, than erected any
 “ standing Fabrick of it.

The last Act of Royal Power performed by our Blessed Saviour whilst he continued on Earth, and which especially challenges our Consideration, because it respects the Government of the Church, not only immediately after he left this lower World, but also in all future Ages; was, his demising Power and Authority to his Apostles, and by them to their Successors to the end of the World. The Blessed *Jesus* came into the World to be a King, and in his Baptism received an Unction to this Office: but besides this, he had an Additional Title thereto by his inestimable Purchase thereof, *viz.* his Humiliation, in assuming our Nature, and his Submission to an accursed Death, (of which before;) and from thence a full Right to, and actual Entrance thereon, upon his Conquest of Death at his Resurrection; though the solemn Investiture was upon his Ascension, and thenceforward sitting at the Right Hand of his Father. As ^{*} *he died, so he rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living: And upon his rising, this Lordship was conferred on him, as he declares, Matth. 28. 18. All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth.* And by vertue of this,

^{*} Rom. 14. 9.

he C
 also
 fame
 ed hi
 (wēp
 ever
 sent
 and e
 tutes
 presse
 Tens
 the R
 rors,
 to gov
² sent
 Bond
 delive
 presse
 tells u
 Apost
 the W
 under
 of his
 ascend
 Hand
 lity, a
 very n
 also in
 under
 the Ch
 the Pl
 commi
 vests t
 withal
 the Wo
 succour

he Commissions his Apostles in the next Verse, as also *John* 20. 21. where he invests them with the same Authority, with which the Father had invested him. *As my Father (ἀπέσταλκε) hath sent me, so (πέμπω) send I you.* How narrow and limited soever their former Commission might be, when first sent out, *Matth.* 10. 1, 6, 7. yet this is large, full and extensive, in which he makes them his Substitutes here on Earth. That *Matth.* 16. 19. is expressed in the Future Tense, this in the Present Tense. He sends them out, as 'twas the Custom of the *Roman* Senate, and afterwards of the ⁷ Emperors, to send Proconsuls, Procurators and Presidents to govern the Provinces under them: Or as God ² sent *Moses* into *Egypt*, to rescue the *Israelites* out of Bondage: And afterwards ³ the *Judges* to save and deliver the same People from their Enemies that oppressed them: But chiefly, as our Saviour himself tells us, as the Father had sent him, so he sent his Apostles: As the Father sent his Son to be Lord of the World, so he sent his Apostles to be Governors under him, and his Deputies in the Administration of his spiritual Kingdom. He was suddenly to ascend into Heaven, and ^b to be set at God's Right Hand in the Heavenly places, far above all Principality, and Power, and Might, and Dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this World, but also in that which is to come: To have all things put under his Feet; and to be the Head over all things to the Church which is his Body. In order therefore to the Planting and Governing of this Society, he commits this great Trust to his Apostles, and invests them with full Authority for that end; and withal promises, that he'll be with them to the end of the World, (he continuing at God's Right Hand to succour and protect his Church;) and also that be-

⁷ 1 Pet. 2. 14.

² Exod. 3. 10. and 4. 13.

³ 1 Sam. 12. 11.

^b Eph. 1. 20, 21, 22, 23.

16 *An History of the Government*

ing gone from them, he would *send them the Comforter*, for which end they were to tarry ^c at Jerusalem, waiting for the Promise of the Father, which they had heard of him; And assures them, that they should receive Power, after the Holy Ghost was come upon them. They being thus impowered, were ^d to preach Peace, the Glad-tidings of Reconciliation and Salvation by Jesus Christ, and that he was Lord of all: And were commanded by Christ to preach unto the People, and to testify that it was he who was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead: And how God anointed this Jesus of Nazareth to this supreme Dignity with the Holy Ghost and with Power, which he manifested by his Miracles of Benignity, doing thereby much good, and healing all that were oppressed with the Devil: for God was with him. To which he gave the highest Testimony, by enabling him to work such Miracles, but especially in that God raised him the third Day and shewed him openly, or manifestly. These Apostles were chosen by him to be *Witnesses*, as of other things that he did, which were sufficient Proofs of his Divine Mission, so particularly of his Resurrection, which as they were commanded to testify, so we find they did it with all boldness, even before his Murderers, to the hazard of their Lives. We find likewise the Commission Christ gave to his Apostles expressed, *Matth. 28. 19. Go and (μαθητεύσατε) disciple all Nations*, i. e. summon all Mankind to become my Scholars, and to live under my Discipline, and to become Subjects of my Kingdom: In which as he constitutes the Apostles the Ministers of his Kingdom, so he intimates the extent of his Kingdom and Jurisdiction, and of theirs under him, *All Nations*, or as it is in *St. Mark 16. 15. Every Creature*, all, both Jews and Gentiles: And then orders them to admit such that are willing to be his Subjects into that Society, by baptizing them into

^c *Acts 1. 4, 8.*

^d *Acts 10. 36, 42, 38.*

the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Where he institutes Baptism, which the Jews had used in admitting Profelytes, John the Baptist and himself in admitting Disciples, to be the permanent solemn Rite of initiating Members into his Church, *μυστήριον* of that sacred Society, Citizens of the New Jerusalem, and thence intitled to the Privileges of that Polity; and obliged to obey its Laws and Constitutions. That which follows in Christ's Commission, is, *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* Where he makes this one great part of their Office; to instruct them, whom by Baptism they had solemnly listed under his Banner and enrolled as his Subjects, what Duties were incumbent on them as such, or what were the Statutes and Constitutions of that Society they were Members of, which they were bound to observe, in order to enjoy its singular Privileges.

The Apostles thus invested with Authority, had a Right to all those Titles which are in the Holy Scriptures bestowed on them, and on such as did assist or succeed them in governing the Church: some of these are such as have chiefly Relation to the Church, as ^e ἡγούμενοι, *Leaders, Guides,* or such that have Rule, ^f Πρεσβύτεροι, *Presidents,* Persons set over the People, ^g Παστορες, *Pastors,* to whose care a Flock was committed, and the like names: And others that had a greater respect to Christ himself, as ^h Ἀποστόλοι, *Ambassadors,* acting for Christ and in his stead with Men, and receiving their Commission from him; *Stewards,* Οἰκονόμοι, such as are set over Christ's Family to manage the Concerns thereof under him the great Householder. All these, and other Names of the like Importance, signify Power and Authority, and most of them imply a Right to govern; and consequently, when the Church is

^e Heb. 13. 17.

^f 1 Thess. 5. 12.

^g 2 Cor. 5. 20.

18 *An History of the Government*

their Province, to act answerably to the nature of this Society, and to the Offices committed to them by the supreme Lord and Governour thereof, that tend to preserve the Peace, and promote the Welfare thereof.

The next words in the Commission that Christ gives his Apostles, contain a Promise of his continued Presence among them; *Matth. 28. 20. Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World.* These words as they imply the duration of the Society, which Christ will defend against all opposition, so that ⁱ *the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it*, as he had formerly promised, as also the continuance of the Institutions, which he saw requisite for its well-being, particularly Baptism: So likewise (which chiefly comes under our present Consideration) of Officers who are necessary to its subsistence. For tho' this was spoken only to the Apostles, yet when these should not live *to the end of the World*, the Promise must necessarily extend to others, who should succeed them in their Office, and consequently implies a Power in them to elect and set apart others to the discharge of the Office, and those others in a continued Succession. The Rite used by Christ himself to confer this Power, was *breathing* on the Apostles, a Rite proper to him from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds: That used by the Apostles and their Successors, was *Imposition of Hands*, a Rite used by *Moses*, and appointed by God himself.

Farther, when the Church of Christ was to be of a vast extent, and was so even in the Apostles days, that it was impossible for the Apostles themselves to baptize all their Converts, and however all their Progeny; to model them into particular Societies, or however when thus modelled, in their own Persons to instruct and teach them their Christian Duties; to preside in their Assemblies, and therein

ⁱ *Matth. 16. 18.*

assist them in their solemn Worship, and to administer the Holy Sacraments, with other Ministries; As also (at least after their decease) to govern and execute Discipline, and to ordain Persons for these Ministries: It was necessary for the Apostles, in order to accomplish the Trust committed to them by Christ (and consequently implied in their Commission) to appoint Officers to discharge these Ministries, both in that and in the following Ages; and these in a due subordination to each other, without which Peace and Order could not be maintained: that is, that the lower Orders should administer in sacred Offices with a due dependence on the superior; and that those of the supremest Office, and the Successors of the Apostles should govern the Church, and by Ordination convey Power to others to execute the sacred Ministries in their several Stations. To this the practice of the Apostles and of the following Age was conformable, as will afterwards appear, though in a gradual procedure, as the Necessities of the Church required.

Neither ought it to be any Objection against this, because it is not expressed in the Commission, when it is necessarily implied; because such a subordination of Officers is requisite in all Societies, and it is the Prerogative of the superior Officers, as to govern, so to appoint and constitute inferior Officers; and therefore not to be denied to this Society which was founded by the All-wise God. Neither was it requisite that all particulars of this kind should then be revealed to the Apostles; in that Christ had promised to *lead them into all Truth*, and therefore to discover what was necessary for the Churches welfare. These Revelations were given at such times as the Exigencies of the Church required, and the Apostles themselves were fitted to receive them. Thus we find they were directed in many incidental Cases, and may conclude they were so in others of

as great or greater Moment, according to which they framed their Practice.

One thing farther we may observe in this Commission, that *all* the Apostles were invested with equal Authority, and that every one of them had the same share in the Government of the Church with *St. Peter*. As there was nothing in the first Choice and Mission of the Apostles to induce us to believe any Supremacy over the rest conferred on him by our Saviour, nor any thing of that kind assumed by himself, or acknowledged by the other Apostles. 'Tis owned that Christ expressed a greater Respect to some of his Apostles than to others, as to accompany him in his Transfiguration, Agony, &c. But as this implies no Supremacy, so *St. John* and *St. James* have an equal share with *St. Peter*. 'Tis withal acknowledged, that our Blessed Saviour frequently directs his Speech to him in things which concerned all the Apostles, and that he answers for them: That he is named first among the Apostles, and some other things of this kind, which imply a Preference, and shew that he was the Foreman of them: But none of this, or any thing else that is urged out of the holy Scriptures by the *Romanists*, is of any validity to prove him to be the Head of the Church, or give him a superiority over the rest of the Apostles, as might have been shewn. But this has been done by learned Persons^k. However, when our Blessed Saviour gave his last Commission to his Apostles, immediately before he left them, both in *John* 20. 21, 22, 23. and *Matth.* 28. 19. when this was a thing of so great a concernment to the Church, we might have here expected to have found a plain Declaration of it; but instead thereof Christ confers an equal Power on all his Apostles, equally authorizing them to plant and govern

^k *Dr. Barrow of the Pope's Supremacy, and Dr. Potter of the Rights of the Church, ch. 3. §. 2. and others.*

his Church. And besides this, we never find St. *Peter* challenging any superiority, nor do our Adversaries pretend any future Revelations for this Grant, or produce any Facts which intimate, much less prove this to have been acknowledged by the Apostles themselves, or the Church in that, or the immediate following Ages.

C H A P. II.

Of the Government of the Church under the Apostles.

Hitherto our Blessed Saviour governed his little Flock in his own Person; but now having substituted his Apostles to administer this Office here on Earth, he ascended into Heaven, and sits at the Right Hand of the Father, there to exercise his Kingly Power in the Government of his Church as its supreme Head, and *the Head over all things to the Church*, for its Service and Benefit. Presently after our Saviour's Ascension into Heaven, we find the eleven Apostles, together with other Followers of our Blessed Saviour, in all to the number of 120, assembled together, *Acts* 1. 13, 15. In this Assembly St. *Peter* shews the necessity of choosing another Apostle into the room of *Judas*. *Christ* had appointed Twelve to this Office, answering to the Twelve Tribes of *Israel*, and had promised them that they should sit on Twelve Thrones to judge the Twelve Tribes of *Israel*. This was the number that he had appointed of the first Planters and Governors of his Church; and consequently, when the number was lessened by the Treason and Death of *Judas*, there was a necessity incumbent on the Eleven to fill up the number, by electing one into

22 *An History of the Government*

his Place. In doing which they pitch on Two who had all along conversed with Christ (and probably were of the Seventy) and had been Witnesses of his Miracles and Resurrection: and then immediately, by casting *Lots, the disposal whereof is from the Lord*, appeal to God's determination, that (as a learned Person expresses it) "the Person chose into the " Apostleship might not come behind themselves, " or want the Characteristic of an Apostle, being " chosen by the Interposition and Designation of " their great Master. In this the People seem to have no other part, but only to present their humble Supplications to Almighty God, that he would direct the Lot. And hence (as the same learned Person observes) " the word *συγκληρονομήσαν* is " rightly rendered in our Translation, *he was num-* " *bred with* the eleven Apostles: and that it cannot " be truly rendered *he was chosen by Suffrages*, unless " it be thought fit to assert likewise, that at the " same time the People voted the other Eleven also " into the Apostleship.

Our Blessed Saviour being by his Ascension exalted far above all Principality and Power, and Might, and Dominion, and every Name that is named^a. And being thus^b ascended on high, and having led Captivity captive, triumphed over his Enemies, Death and Hades, and being invested with full Power, gave Gifts unto Men, and conferred the Holy Spirit on them miraculously at the Feast of Pentecost, " when there appeared to them cloven Tongues, like unto Fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and spake with Tongues. The Apostles who were before chosen and authorised to govern the Church, were then solemnly inaugurated, and (as it was customary for Kings, Priests and Prophets in former times) anointed to execute their Office; the Gift of the Holy Spirit being frequently

^a Eph. 1. 21, 22.

^b Eph. 4. 8.

^c Acts 2. 3, 4.
express

expressed by *Unction* in the holy Scriptures: By which they were invested in their Office, publicly declared the Legates of the King of Heaven by this illustrious Testimony from Heaven, and likewise hereby received Power and Energy to execute their difficult and weighty Undertaking. There was need of Credentials to convince them to whom they were sent, of the Truth of their Mission and Deputation, that they were indeed the Embassadors of the King of Kings: And withal, they stood in need of extraordinary Assistance to enable them to discharge a Work, wherein they must conflict with infinite difficulties. Both of these were effected by this miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost. The first, in that the fiery Tongues were as illustrious, though a less terrible Testimony of God's immediate Presence with them, as were the Smoke and Burnings, the Thunders and Lightnings on Mount *Sinai*: and the efficacy thereof admirably surprizing, that Men of different Nations and Languages should hear illiterate Persons speaking Languages peculiar to their own Country, which they had never formerly been acquainted with; as also the enabling them to give ^d *soundness* to the *Cripple* ^e, Health to the *Sick*, and Recovery to such *as were vexed with unclean Spirits*, and the like Miracles, which were evident Attestations of their divine Mission. And then, secondly, this afforded them Help and Assistance in their difficult Employment: for when they were to preach the Gospel to all Nations, 'twas necessary that they should speak the Languages of those Nations, in order to be understood by them; and when infallibly to declare the Will of God to Mankind, to have the *Holy Spirit to lead them into all Truth*; and when to conflict with the rooted Prejudices of some, and the inveterate Malignity of others, to be inspired with singular Courage and Magnanimity (*ωαρρυσία*) so

^d *Act.* 3. 7.

^e *Act.* 5. 16.

as not to be terrified by the latter, nor discouraged by the former, in persuading them to embrace the Gospel, tho' it thwarted their secular Interests, and prejudicate Opinions.

The Apostles, who improved all Opportunities of promoting the Kingdom of their Lord and Master, made use of the Concourse occasioned by this Miracle, and the Astonishment thereby wrought in the Beholders, to call them to Repentance. ^f *Peter with the eleven* told them, how this was a fulfilling of that which had been foretold by *Joel* to happen *in the last days* (i. e. of the Jewish Polity, and in the first of Christ's Kingdom;) that this was a gracious effect of Christ's Exaltation; that *Jesus*, whom they had murdered, and *God* had raised again, was by the right hand of *God* exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, had shed forth that, which they now saw and heard: And that thus Christ had exerted his Kingly Power that *God* the Father had conferred on him, which was a convincing Evidence of his being instated in that Sovereignty, so that *all the house of Israel* ought to know assuredly, and acknowledge it by submitting to his Sceptre, that *God* had made that same *Jesus* whom they had crucified both Lord and Christ. On which Miracle of the visible Descent of the Spirit, of the Consequent of it, and the Sermon thereupon preached; we find Christ's Kingdom enlarged, and an Addition made of *three thousand* Subjects, who upon their Conversion, were immediately by Baptism enrolled in that number: As there was afterwards ^g of *five thousand*; and after that a new Addition. ^h *There were added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women*: And ⁱ the Number of the Disciples was increased, and multiplied in *Jerusalem* greatly. And a great number of the Priests (*Syriac* reads) of the Jews, were obedient

^f *Acts* 2. 14, 16, 17, 24, 33, 36, 41.

^h *Acts* 5. 14.

ⁱ *Acts* 6. 1, 7.

^g *Acts* 4. 4.

to the
other
and
stant
prob
postl
house
Asser
in, b
Conv
the a
divid
but
raise
cessity
20.)
many
no w
true,
tinue
be so
ing f
in an
proce
the E
Conv
Th
which
sertin
who
persu
their
three
We f
Fellow
Whic
Mini

to the Faith; and all these latter Conversions were at other times than the first at the Feast of *Pentecost*, and hence of Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, who constantly resided there, and not of Strangers. And 'tis probable that on the Increase of the Church, the Apostles were hence necessitated ^k to *break bread from house to house*, in several Houses there being several Assemblies, the upper Room they before assembled in, being not capacious enough to contain the first Converts, the three thousand. If so at first, then the after Additions shew the necessity of their being divided into many more Congregations; tho' still but ^l the one Church of *Jerusalem*, a persecution being raised against the Church. And much more a necessity of many Congregations, when we find (*Act. 21. 20.*) that St. James tells St. Paul, that there were so many *Myriads* of Jews that believed. And there is no wonder at this, if what *Apollonius* reports be true, that the Apostles, by Christ's Command continued twelve Years at *Jerusalem*, that there should be so great Accessions to the Church, if the following success of the Apostles Labours was answerable in any proportion to what it was at first: Which proceeded from the Prevalency of their Doctrine, the Efficacy of their Miracles, and the influence the Converts had on their Families and nearest Relations.

Thus we have seen the first Act of Authority which the Apostles exerted, in their courageous asserting the Sovereignty of Christ, even before them who had rejected and murdered him, whom they persuade to Repentance, and Submission to him as their Lord and King; and this with singular Success, three thousand being thereby added to the Church. We find these ^m continued in the Apostles Doctrine and Fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in Prayer: Which intimates a farther Execution of the Apostles Ministry, in teaching the Doctrine that these Chri-

^k *Acts* 2. 46.

^l *Acts* 8. 1.

^m *Acts* 2. 42.

26 *An History of the Government*

stians continued in, in associating them in that Communion, in consecrating and administering the Holy Eucharist, and in their presiding in Prayer. For when some particular Persons must discharge these Ministries, none can be more reasonably supposed to do it, than those who were intrusted with those Ministries, *viz.* the *Apostles*: Tho whether the *Seventy* might not be their Assistants in some Administrations (particularly in Baptizing their numerous Converts, suitably to what seems to be practis'd, *Act.* 10. where St. Peter commanded *Cornelius* and the rest *to be baptized*) it would be Presumption to determine, when therein the holy Scriptures are silent. However, such things, which were properly Acts of Government, were wholly transacted by the Apostles themselves; as "the dreadful Punishment of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, who, for their sacrilegious detaining of that which they had devoted to God's Service, and *lying to the Holy Ghost*, were struck dead by St. Peter. As was ° *Simon Magus*. for his endeavouring with Money to purchase the Power of conferring the Gift of the Holy Ghost, by the same Apostle excluded from Christian Communion, being declared to have *neither part nor lot in that matter*: And besides this, the instituting of a new Office, and ordaining the Persons chosen to be of it, *viz.* the *Deacons*, which they found necessary upon an Accident that happen'd in this Church of *Jerusalem*, *Acts* 6. 1, 2, 3. which last I shall more particularly consider.

The sacred Historian tells us, that *In those days, when the number of the Disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their Widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the Twelve called the multitude of the Disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that*

" *Acts* 5. 5, 10.

° *Acts* 8. 21.

we sh
Where
of hon
we m
they
the A
hands
Instit
the A
the P
of hon
tion,
sen,
appoin
ple h
to th
and i
and O
the A
solem
when
The
condi
fied,
mitte
der,
Reaso
tion o
Neces
is no
super
As
their
was i
Alms
lificat
they v
nobler
Gospe

we shou'd leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look you out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. And then, after they had chose Stephen, &c. v. 6. they set them before the Apostles, and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them. Where we may observe, that the Institution of this Office of *Deacons* was wholly from the Apostles; that the *Number* and *Qualifications* of the Persons were prescribed by them, *Seven men* and *of honest report*, &c. That they reserve the *Approbation*, and at least the *Ordination* of the Persons chosen, and probably Both to themselves, *whom we may appoint over this business*. And that when the People had chosen them, *they set them before the Apostles*, to the end that they might judge of their Choice, and if they approved them, proceed to ratifie it, and *Ordain* them. And this last wholly belonged to the Apostles, and was performed by them by the solemn Rite of Imposition of their Hands: *And when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them*. The Choice indeed of the *Deacons*, (which yet was conditional, and supposes the Persons duly qualified, of which the Apostles were Judges) was committed to the multitude of Disciples: And no wonder, when one chief part of their Office, and the Reason assigned of its Institution, was the distribution of the Peoples Charity, and suiting it to the Necessities of the indigent. But their Right in this, is no good Argument to infer their Right to elect superior Officers in the Church.

As for the Office of *Deacons*, one great part of their Employment, and that for which the Office was instituted, was, to take care of the Churches Alms. But by their Actions, as well as their Qualification of being *filled with the Holy Ghost*, by which they were fitted for them, we find them discharging nobler Employments, *viz.* that of *preaching* the Gospel, and *baptizing* their Converts. The first
St. Ste-

St. Stephen did, St. Philip the Deacon both. St. Stephen^p, as he did great wonders and miracles among the people, so he preached to them, (this being that for which he was accused, and after stoned) that Jesus should destroy that place, and change the Customs that Moses delivered: And his Adversaries that disputed with him, were not able to resist the Wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake. St. Philip, (not the Apostle, for he with the other eleven tarried at Jerusalem, but) the Deacon, said to be one of the seven, Acts 21. 8. and there, from this work, called the Evangelist, ^q went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ to them. And when the people gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, and believed him preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized by him both men and women. Farther, we find what St. Paul saith, ^r that they who have used the office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, καλὸν βαθμὸν, a good step, or recommendation to a superior Office in the Church: Which implies something more, than that they were faithful and diligent in taking care of the Poor; and (as it is observed by others) that they were not only Δάκονοι τραπέζων, but also Δάκονοι λόγῳ, not only ministred about Tables, but were also Ministers of Word and Doctrine. So John surnamed Mark, is styled as ὁ ὑποδιάκονος, the same as Deacon, ^s so one of St. Paul's Fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God.

The Apostles still continue at Jerusalem, which is evident when they are ^t excepted out of the number of them who were dispersed upon the Persecution which followed the Death of St. Stephen. They were ^u commanded by Christ to tarry in the city of Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them; and 'tis probable they might, (of which more presently) by

^p Acts 6. 8, 9, 10, 14. ^q Acts 8. 5, 6, 12. ^r 1 Tim. 3. 13.
^s Acts 13. 5. ^t Coloss. 4. 10, 11. ^u Acts 8. 1. ^w Luk. 24. 49.
 some

some
 some
 joint
 at ha
 upon
 the w
 but e
 where
 tiplica
 Coun
 addre
 Disci
 Th
 ria,
 who w
 St. Ph
 the wo
 who w
 they m
 fallen
 name
 them,
 Ministr
 called)
 preach
 Jerusale
 superior
 power
 had be
 by the
 this wa
 fice of
 to them
 Govern
 confer
 postles
 Reason

some further Divine Revelation, be enjoined for some longer time to continue there. Here they jointly preside and govern the Church, and are ready at hand to assist them, who, * being scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, preached the word, as far as Phœnice, and Cyprus, and Antioch; but especially † in Judæa, and Galilee, and Samaria, where Churches were planted, had rest, and were multiplied: To these Churches the Apostles afforded Counsel and Assistance, when they were occasionally addressed to and consulted, and in them executed Discipline. Of which we have several Instances.

The first concerns the new Converts at Samaria, Acts 8. 14, 15, 16, 17. For when the Apostles who were at Jerusalem heard of the good success of St. Philip's Ministry, viz. that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. St. Philip's Ministry, he being only a Deacon, and (as after called) an Evangelist, extended no farther than to preach and baptize. And therefore the Apostles at Jerusalem sent two of their Number, who were of a superior Office, to perfect what the other had no power to effect; They laid their hands on them who had been baptized by Philip, and they received thereby the Holy Ghost. From whence it appears, that this was a Privilege appropriated to this higher Office of Apostles, and reserved as a proper Ministry to them, and to those who should succeed them in the Government of the Church, by Imposition of Hands to confer the Holy Ghost: And this Practice of the Apostles at Samaria is made by the ancient Fathers the Reason of confining that Office, which we call Con-

* Acts 11. 19.

† Acts 9. 31.

30 *An History of the Government*

firmation, to Bishops. 'Tis true, that the Gift of the Holy Ghost, then conferred on Christian Converts, was extraordinary, and somewhat discerned by others; when *Simon Magus* is said to see it, *Θεοαπομυστος*; possibly the *Shechinahs*, the appearances as of Fire upon them, or that of *Fiery Tongues* mention'd *Acts* 2. Or at least as it produced some extraordinary Effect, such as ability to speak with divers Tongues, by which some of them might be fitted to minister in the Service of God, and to be Guides to that Church, under the Presidency of the Apostles. Yet this doth not exclude the ordinary Operations of the Holy Spirit in renewing and sanctifying their Souls, nor the conferring these gracious effects of the Holy Spirit on others, who did not receive the extraordinary Gifts, which cannot be proved to have been received by all: Tho' 'tis clearly implied, that all who were baptized by *St. Philip*, received Imposition of the *Apostles* Hands, which we must not conceive was wholly useless; and hence may rationally conclude, that those Graces of the Holy Spirit were thereby conferred on them, which are necessary for every Christian; such are ² *the Spirit of fear, of love, and of a sound mind*: And we find that these were the Gift of God, which (among other Gifts) were in *Timothy* by the putting on of the *Apostles* hands. † And we may infer, that the continued Practice of the Church in confining this Office to Bishops, who succeed the Apostles in the Government of the Church, and the expectation of such ordinary gracious Effects, when miraculous Effects ceased, by the Imposition of their Hands; are not unreasonably deduced from this Place by the ancient Fathers, who being nearest the Apostles times, may on that reason be well suposed best acquainted with their Actions, and the Reasons of them.

² 2 *Tim.* 1. 6, 7. Government, ch. 5.

† See this handled by *Dr. Potter* of *Church*

C H A P. III.

Of the first Ministers that officiated in Christian Assemblies. Of Presbyters.

BEfore I proceed to other Instances of Government exercised by the blessed Apostles, it may deserve our Thoughts how the Worship of God was perform'd in Christian Assemblies, and presuming it done by the *Apostles* in the Congregations at *Jerusalem*, whilst they resided there, by what Ministers 'twas performed in other Churches, and at *Jerusalem* after their departure thence. For as there was a necessity that the Gospel should be preached to Strangers and Infidels in order to convert them, and that Converts should be baptized; so also, that they who were Christian Professors should be farther instructed in their Christian Duties, join in *Prayers* and *Praises* to Almighty God, and communicate together of the Body and Blood of Christ, as we are told, *Acts* 2. 42. the first Christians did. To the performance of which, as there was an Obligation to assemble together, so there was a necessity of having Persons who were fitted and empowered to discharge these several Ministrations in their Assemblies, viz. to teach, baptize, offer up publick Prayers, and consecrate the Lord's Supper. To the effecting hereof God had plentifully poured out his Holy Spirit, whereby many were fitted for these Offices, and seem from thence to have a Call to discharge them, at least till proper Officers were appointed to that end. We find, *Acts* 8. 4. that *they who were scattered abroad*, upon the Persecution which ensued upon St. Stephen's death, *went preaching the word*, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον, acting as *Evangelists*. I acknowledge it possible, that as the Deacons

CONS

32 *An History of the Government*

cons (as appears from St. Philip's Ministry at *Samaria*, his converting and baptizing the Eunuch; for as St. Stephen was persecuted for his preaching, so might these, and thence flee from *Jerusalem*,) so also the *Seventy* might be the Persons there chiefly spoken of. Yet when we find mention of Πνευματικοί, Persons that had Spiritual Gifts, and of *Prophets*, as one kind of these spiritual Persons, I see no Reason these should be excluded: Especially when this was customary among the Jews, as is evident from our Saviour's practice at *Nazareth*, *Luk. 4. 16.* where he read and expounded some part of Holy Scripture, καὶ τὸ εἰσὼς αὐτοῦ, according to his custom: And also from the Invitation that St. Paul and St. Barnabas (*Acts 13. 14, 15.*) received from the Rulers of the Synagogue at *Antioch in Pisidia*, who sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on. Tho' withal, we find (*Acts 11. 21.*) that the hand of the Lord was with them, enabling them to work Miracles to confirm the Gospel they preached; which were withal signal evidences from Heaven of their Mission to this Work, and might be the reason why they were invited to the exercise of it; and hence can be no precedent for Lay-Preachers; till they can shew the like Testimonials. We find likewise *Ananias* baptized St. Paul, for which indeed he received an immediate Commission from God himself to authorize him to do it: I know it might be alleged that he was one of the *Seventy*, or might by the Apostles be ordained a *Presbyter*: But when we find nothing of these in the sacred History, and that he is only stiled μαθητής, a *Disciple*, a Name generally given in the *Acts* to private Christians (ιδιωταις); 'tis probable he was one of these, and had only an extraordinary Commission from Heaven to baptize and restore Sight to St. Paul. It may likewise be collected as probable, that these Persons, thus endowed with spiritual Gifts, might be the Guides and Assistents of Christians in their publick

pu
14
by
in
of
lear
shal
shal
Chr
wor
(in
ated
high
the
them
whe
Euch
ctice
Mar
Apo
Conf
This
to th
that
of th
Mind
of St.
" we
" ord
" tau
But
rant f
cred
times

Mr.
Jus
Omn
initia co
Ecclesiā

publick solemn Prayers and Praises, from 1 Cor. 14. 14, 15. where we find mention of *Praying* (πνεύματι) *by the Spirit*, and *singing by the Spirit*: And possibly in that Infancy of the Church in the Administration of the *Lord's Supper*, the Holy Eucharist; as a very learned Person supposes, from v. 16. *Else when thou shalt bless with the Spirit* (in an unknown tongue) *how shall he that occupieth the room* (ἰδιώτης) *of the private Christian say Amen ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ*; in that the word *Eucharistia*, which we translate *Giving of thanks*, (in which sense likewise εὐλογία is used) is appropriated by Christians to the *Lord's Supper*, which is the highest Act of Thanksgiving, and commemorates the greatest Blessing vouchsafed to Mankind, and may thence be presumed to be so used here: Especially, when saying *Amen* is mentioned to be done at this Eucharist by the Lay-Christian, which was the Practice of the Church even in the time of *Justin Martyr*, who lived in the next Age to that of the Apostles, and therefore we may probably judge in Conformity to the practice of the Apostolic Age. This those *Christian Prophets* might do in conformity to the practice of the *Jewish Church*, where we find that *Prophets*, such as *Samuel* and *Elijah*, tho' not of the Tribe of *Levi*, offered Sacrifices. Of this Mind *Hilary* seems to be, who goes under the name of *St. Ambrose*, on Eph. 4. 10. "After Churches were every where settled, things were otherwise ordered than they were at first. For at first all taught, and all baptized.

But here I must observe, that this can be no warrant for any Laic in our Days to perform these sacred Offices, because some did so in those early times of Christianity; in that those Persons, on

* Mr. Dodwell de Sacerdot. Laic. C. 3. §. 2.

* Just. M. Apolog. 2.

* Omnes docebant, & omnes baptizabant. Et mox, Omnibus inter initia concessum est & Evangelizare & baptizare & Scripturas in Ecclesiâ explanare.

34 *An History of the Government*

whom such extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost were conferred, became not only enabled to discharge these Offices, but were also thereby authorized to perform them; their miraculous Inspirations being an *Unction* to this Office, and a Call from Heaven. And hence *Prophets* were numbred among the first Church Officers, ^d whom God had given for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Consequently, for any unordained Persons to take on them these Offices, unless they can evidence the like immediate Call from Heaven, by their receiving Power from thence to work Miracles, to speak Languages they had never learned, &c. they will become guilty of the like Usurpation in this spiritual Kingdom, as it would be in an earthly Kingdom for any one to assume the Character of an Ambassador or other publick Minister, and to act as such without any Commission from the Sovereign. For as the Apostle argues in one Case, ^e *how shall they preach, unless they are sent?* so may we in others; how shall they baptize, how shall they administer the Lord's Supper, &c. unless they receive a Mission from Christ for that end, by the hands of them, whom he hath invested with Authority to convey it? And I entreat such to consider whether they have not ground to fear the Effects of God's Displeasure for such a Presumption and Usurpation; if not in the same manner and in this Life, as some time was inflicted on *Uzzah* and *Uzziah*, who in an unadvised Zeal executed the Sacerdotal Office without any Call to it; yet hereafter, when they shall appear before the great Tribunal.

Before I proceed, I would here propound one thing to the Reader's Consideration, and that is, that no Judgment can be made, nor certain Conclusion gathered what should be the standing fixed Offi-

^d *I ph. 4. 11, 12.*

^e *Rom. 10. 15.*

cers
St. A
who
8, 9,
of th
no ea
so to
term
were
Extra
the t
of the
dated
the C
as w
Proph
respec
that n
divers
that t
phets
Christ
Govern
nishing
to Go
the Tr
lar Of
on an
Church
except
the In
cers w
But
solemn
first, a
safed I
Conver
the Ne
in that

cers of the Church from the Enumeration, which St. Paul gives us, of the kinds of (Πνευματικοί) them who had received Spiritual Gifts, either in 1 Cor. 12, 8, 9, 10. Or Eph. 4, 11. For as we find no Footsteps of these in the following Ages of the Church, so 'tis no easy thing to know what these Offices were, or so to distinguish them from one another, as to determine which of them were standing Offices, that were to be continued in the Church, and which only Extraordinary and Temporary, and only of use in the times of the Apostles. Tho' the Names of some of them, as *Pastors* and *Teachers* may be accommodated to the Ministries of perpetual continuance in the Church of God, and others plainly signify such as were proper to that first Age, as *Apostles* and *Prophets*; yet I suppose rather that they had all a respect to the Officers at that time. And 'tis plain that many of the Words used by St. Paul import not divers Offices, but particular Gifts, which were at that time vouchsafed chiefly to the Apostles, Prophets and Ministers, and sometimes even to other Christians. Such ἀντιλήψεις & κυβερνήσεις *Helps* and *Governments* evidently imply, viz. the Spirit's furnishing the Apostles, and others whose work it was to Govern the Church, with Abilities to discharge the Trust committed to them, and not any particular Office in the Church of Christ; nor did it confer on any Authority to Exercise Government in the Church, without some farther Call: Unless we except the Case aforementioned of the *Pneumatici* in the Infancy of the Church, before particular Officers were instituted.

But I shall return from this digression. Though solemn Offices were perform'd by the *Pneumatici* at first, and that in those places where God had vouchsafed large Effusions of his holy Spirit on the first Converts, yet we may collect from many Passages in the New Testament, that this was but Temporary, in that we find, *Acts* 11. 19, 20, 21, 22. when great

numbers of *Jews* were converted to the Faith, who dwelt at *Phanice*, *Cyprus* and *Antioch*, by the preaching of those Christians who were scattered abroad upon the Persecution that arose about *Stephen*; that upon the Tidings of this happy success, the Church of *Jerusalem* sent forth *Barnabas* that he should go as far as *Antioch* to perfect what was so happily begun by others. Had *St. Barnabas* been then, as we are assured he was afterwards, invested with Apostolic Power, we might conclude that he went to *Antioch* on the same Errand (as he was sent by the same Persons) that *St. Peter* and *St. John* went to *Samaria*, after many of that City had believed and were baptized by *St. Philip's* Ministry; of which before: But if not as an *Apostle*, then to officiate as a *Presbyter*. And because the number of Christians (a name first there given them) was great, and the Work proportionable, he went to *Tarsus* to seek *Saul*, and brought him to *Antioch*, to assist him in his Ministry. For they assembled themselves with the Church, v. 26. to be sure to do the Work of Christian Assemblies, which was (as *Acts* 2. 42.) *Communion, breaking of Bread, and Prayers*, and to instruct them who were a great Company, ὄχλος ἰκανός, a large Multitude.

At this time we find mention of *Presbyters*, v. 30. which our Translation renders (less conveniently) *Elders*, and these Officers of the Church of *Jerusalem*, to whom the Christians at *Antioch* sent their pious Contributions by the Hands of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, at the time of the *Famine* which came to pass in the Reign of *Claudius Cæsar*. Here's the first mention of *Presbyters*, and of the Church in which they were Officers, viz. that of *Jerusalem*, the great Mother Church, the place of the Apostles first and joint Residence, and therefore if they were not the *Seventy*, and so of *Christ's* Institution, they were (we may be assured) instituted by the Apostles. If this last, we are not told when it was, or on what

Occa-

Occ
assur
and
beca
by t
plan
med
the
Inscr
spec
Chur
try:
Neit
Epis
pus
Colof
of w
wegi
trans
Chur
not t
conti
Notw
Proph
the C
of th
Epist
ed wi
byter
to th
(as ha
by th
those
ferred
them
Th
cases
safed
and t

Occasion, in the sacred History. We are indeed assured that they were in the Church of *Jerusalem*, and known to be so by the Christians at *Antioch*, because they directed their Charity to be received by them; but nothing farther. As for other new planted Churches we find not that the Apostles immediately placed Presbyters in them. We may, by the Apostle St. Paul's not mentioning them in his Inscription to the Churches to which he wrote, suspect the contrary; they being only directed to the Churches, and to the *Saints* of such a City or Country: excepting only the Epistle to the *Philippians*. Neither do we find any intimation of them in the Epistles themselves; unless we should take *Archippus* (*Col. 4. 17.*) for a Presbyter of the Church of *Coloss*, though others think him of an higher Office, of which more *Chap. V.* 'Tis likely indeed that the *ἐπίσκοποι* (*1 Thess. 5. 12.*) those *over them*, (as we translate it) may signify the *Presbyters* of that Church; though what follows, *ver. 19, 20. Quench not the Spirit, despise not Prophesyings*, supposes the continuance of those spiritual Gifts among them. Notwithstanding which 'tis possible there might be *Prophets* and *Pneumatici* together with *Presbyters* in the Church of *Thessalonica*, answerable to the State of the Church of *Corinth*, when St. *Clement* wrote his Epistle to that Church, where the Persons endued with those extraordinary Gifts insulted the Presbyters: Whereas, when St. *Paul* wrote his Epistles to that Church, the solemn Worship of God might (as has been before observed) be possibly performed by the *Pneumatici*, Persons to whom God had given those extraordinary Gifts: as may be probably inferred from the Directions which the Apostle gives them in the use of those Gifts.

The Apostles seem to proceed in this, as in other cases gradually, according to the Revelations vouchsafed to them, which were suited to their Capacities, and the Necessities of the Church. We are sure

38 *An History of the Government*

it was so, in that of admitting uncircumcised *Gentiles* into the Christian Church: For notwithstanding our Saviour's command, that they should *go and disciple all Nations*, yet the Apostles had entertained prejudices common with other *Jews*; from whence they esteemed all other People as *unclean*, and altogether incapable of being Christ's peculiar People, who had not been first admitted into God's *Peculium* by Circumcision: The Falshood of which St. Peter could not be convinced of, until ^e by a Vision from God, he was taught *not to call that common which God had cleansed*; ^g and by God's pouring out the Gift of the Holy Ghost on Cornelius, and other *Gentiles*, (whereby he heard them *speak with Tongues*) in the same manner as on the Apostles at the Feast of *Pentecost*: Neither ^h could the rest of the Apostles and other Christians at *Jerusalem* be satisfied with S. Peter's communicating with these *uncircumcised* Persons, till he had acquainted them with these Discoveries which God had given him of his Will in this thing. And S. Paul calls this ⁱ a *Mystery*, in other Ages unknown, then revealed unto the holy Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit, that the *Gentiles* should be *Fellow-heirs*, and of the same Body. Answerably in other things, and particularly in appointing Officers in the Church, we may suppose these holy Apostles received Revelations from the Holy Ghost. By which means, as *Presbyters* were instituted in the Church of *Jerusalem*, so they were gradually introduced into other Churches; (as afterwards *Bishops* were a little before the Death of the Apostles; concerning which more in its place.) Of which we have an Instance in the Church of *Antioch*, Acts 13. 1. under the name of *διδάσκαλοι*, *Teachers*: And one more express, Acts 14. 23. in the Churches of *Lystra*,

^e Acts 10. 15.

^f Ephes. 3. 4, 5, 6.

^g V. 44, 45, 46.

^h Acts 11. 1. to 19.

Iconium and *Antioch* in *Pisidia*, where the Apostles *S. Paul* and *Barnabas* ordained them *Presbyters* in every Church. The same we may conclude was done by degrees in other Churches, where these *Presbyters* did (ἡλεσεργεῖν) minister in the Worship of God, and in the Affairs of the Church; but still under the Presidency of the Apostles themselves, who during the continuance of the greatest part of them on Earth, governed and executed Discipline in the Church. Hence they were dignified with the name of Πρεσβύτεροι, *Elder*, not given upon account of Age, but as it was a Title of Dignity in the Jewish Church and State, being given to the Heads of Families in general, and even to him who was the Head of the rest, the Superior of those other Elders, the *Rosh avoth*.

And hence taken up in the Christian Church at first in as large a signification. For though it is chiefly used for these Officers of the second Order of the Church, yet it was also used to denote them of the superior Order, so that even the Apostles assumed the Name, and called themselves *Presbyters*, as *S. Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. and *S. John*, 2 *John* 1. And though after the times of the Apostles the Name was appropriated to them of the second Order (of which I am now treating) as *Episcopus* to that of the highest Order; yet we find Latin words that import the same, used by *Tertullian* and by *Firmilian*, viz. *Seniores*, to signify Bishops, as also by this last, *maiores natu*. Of which afterwards. Besides, we find other Names given to them in the New Testament, suited to their Office and several Employments in the Church, yet not so as to be restrained always to them. They are called διδασκαλοι, ^k *Doctors* or *Teachers*, as they who preached the Gospel to Aliens, to bring them into the Church, and who taught these when made Disciples, to observe all things which Christ had commanded: and hence

^k 1 *Cor.* 12. 19.

called *κονεῖς* ¹ & *λόγος* ¹ Ministers of the Word, whose Work was *κατελεῖν*, to admonish, though it's possible that may be chiefly meant of the Ministers of the *ὁ λόγος*, the Eternal Word. *Ποιμῆνες* ^m Pastors or Shepherds, from their feeding their Flock with the spiritual Food of the Word and Sacraments, and their ruling and guiding them. On which last account they are called *πρεσβύτεροι*, ⁿ them that had the Rule. Though withal *Phabe*, a Deaconess of the Church is called *πρεσβυτή* ^o which we translate a *succourer*: And *πρεσβυτός* ^p in *Justin Martyr*, is a Minister who was superior to Deacons, yet might be either of the first or second Order of Christian Priests; and both so called, because they did *πρεσβυτεῖα καλῶν ἔργων*, *Tit. 3. 8.* take care of good Works, acts of Mercy in relieving the Poor (for thus such Acts are called *1 Tim. 6. 18.* and *Acts 9. 36.*) and this is one part of the Office assigned by *Justin Martyr* to the *πρεσβυτός*, to be *κηδεμών*, one that took care of Persons in need. For thus did the Apostles first and the Bishops with the Presbyters afterwards, manage the Treasure of the Church, though the inferior Ministry and the disposal thereof was committed to the Deacons. Thus some Presbyters were peculiarly imployed, and those *καλῶς πρεσβυτεῖα πρεσβύτεροι* ^a who managed this Affair well, are accounted *worthy of double Honour* or Reward, though the other Presbyters who were employed in *Word and Doctrine*, were chiefly to be respected. Another name given to Presbyters is *ἡγούμενοι*, Rulers, Guides, who ^r are to direct Men in the way to attain Happiness, who watch for their Souls, as they that must give Account, that they may do it with Joy, and not with Grief. They had likewise the name of *ἐπίσκοποι*, *Philip. 1. 1.* and elsewhere, particularly

¹ Luke 1. 2.

^o Rom. 16. 2.

^a 1 Tim. 5. 17.

^m Eph. 4. 11.

^p Vide Cl. Dodwelli *Paran.* §. 30.

^r Heb. 13. 7, 17.

ⁿ 1 Thess. 5. 12.

Acts 20. 28. where it is truly translated *Overseers*, such to whom the Care and Oversight of a Flock was committed by the Apostles, and under whom they fed and governed it, in subordination to them. This name was at first given even to inferior Presbyters, till it came to be appropriated to the highest Officers in the Church, when, about the Death of the Apostles, they succeeded them in the Government of the Church.

In order to advance the Office of Presbyters, and to make it appear the highest Office in the Church, the Adversaries of Episcopacy urge that many of the forenamed Titles betoken Dignity and Authority. This is owned in the *Preface*, where their Rights are recited. Yet there are other sacred Rights which the Apostles reserved to themselves and to Bishops their Successors, which they never communicated to Presbyters, nor do the Names given them necessarily imply it; namely the supreme Government of the Church under Christ (in which Presbyters were only of Counsel to the Bishop,) and, to omit others, the Power of Ordination, in which the Presbyters join, yet the Authority is in the Bishop.

The Persons whom the Apostles chose for Presbyters, were ordinarily ἀπαρχαί, the First Fruits, the First Believers or Converts of the Church in which they ministred: For as these were generally endued with extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and so were in that regard pointed out for that sacred Office; so they were peculiarly honoured, and had on the account of their being the first Converts, a peculiar respect put on them by the Apostles. *Stephanas* (1 *Cor.* 16. 15.) has this Badge of Honour set on him by *St. Paul*, that he was Ἀπαρχή, the First Fruits of *Achaia*; and so are *Andronicus* and *Junius* (and esteemed ἐπίσημοι illustrious, or of note among the Apostles) as having been in Christ before himself. And thus *St. Clement* in his Epistle, ch. 42. tells us, that

42 *An History of the Government*

that the Apostles in the Cities and Countries where they had preached the Gospel, καθίστατον ἀπαρχάς, appointed their First-Fruits to be Overseers and Ministers for them who should afterwards believe. From which their early reception into the Church, they, as on other Reasons, deserve the Appellation of πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*; as among the *Jews* the preeminence arose from the Primogeniture, so among Christians to these First-born to Christ.

C H A P. IV.

Of St. James being made Bishop of Jerusalem; no Bishops set as yet over other Churches.

HAVING intimated that the Apostles were about that time dispersed abroad, in order to propagate the Gospel, that St. James the Son of Alphaeus, who was one of them, was made Bishop of Jerusalem; and near that time Presbyters were settled in that Church; 'tis requisite that these things should be set in as clear a light as the matter will admit. This I shall endeavour to do with an humble submission to better Judgments. We find that when the Persecution, which arose after St. Stephen's death, dispersed many of the Christians who dwelt at Jerusalem, the Apostles are excepted out of that number, *Acts* 8. 1. They continuing there notwithstanding the Persecutions which they, as being the Guides of the Christians, might expect from the malignity of the *Jews*. From which we may conclude, that there was some great Obligation that lay on them to do it, which caused them to expose themselves to Calamities, rather than be wanting to their Duty:
And

And hence, that as *Christ* himself *Luke 24. 49.* had commanded them to tarry in the City of Jerusalem until he had endued them with Power from on high, by bestowing the Holy Ghost on them at Pentecost; so he had since that time, by some farther Revelation, enjoined them to continue there for a longer time. Though we have no account thereof in the sacred History, yet we have a Tradition very consonant to their Practice, transmitted by *Apollonius*, a Champion against the *Montanists*, (recorded by *Eusebius* *) that our Saviour commanded his Apostles, that for the space of Twelve Years they should not depart from Jerusalem. This was delivered by a Person who lived in the Reign of *Commodus* about *An. Dom. 180.* and hence being so near the Times of the Apostles, deserves our consideration; especially when so agreeable to what the *Acts of the Apostles* relates concerning them. In this Tradition we have not only *Christ's* command for their continuance at Jerusalem, but also the Term, twelve Years; which expired about the Time wherein *St. James*, the Son of *Zebedee*, was killed by *Herod Agrippa*, and *St. Peter* designed for slaughter, or a little after.

About the time of the expiration of these twelve Years, when ^b a little before they were made sensible of the extent of their Commission to preach to all Nations by the Vision granted to *St. Peter*, and the pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon uncircumcised Gentiles, and possibly awakened by the ^c Death of *St. James* the Son of *Zebedee*, and the design upon *St. Peter*; 'tis most probable that the Apostles dispersed themselves to propagate the Kingdom of their Lord and Master *Jesus Christ*, in prosecution of the Charge he gave them. About which time

* Euseb. Histor. Eccles. l. 5. c. 18. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὡς ἐν τῇ ἐκδόσει
† Ζωὴν φασὶ (viz. Apollonius) προσέλαχεν τοῖς αὐτοῖς
ἀποστόλοις, ἐπὶ δώδεκα ἔτεσι μὴ χωριῶναι τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

^b Acts 11. 1. to 15.

^c Acts 12. 1, 2.

44 *An History of the Government*

St. Paul and St. Barnabas who were likewise *Apostles*, though not of the number of the Twelve, were, after Fasting, Prayer and solemn Benediction, sent abroad upon the same important Employment, by a particular Revelation; *the Holy Ghost having said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them*: which Work we find was to preach in *Cyprus, Pisidia, Pamphylia*, and other Countries, into which they went. The *Acts of the Apostles* doth not tell us into what Country each of the Twelve went, much less whether they agreed upon particular Provinces, or else went as the Providence of God, or some immediate Call directed them, as in ^d St. Paul's case, or as the foresight of the Success of their Labours, gathered by probable Circumstances might induce them. But we may reasonably suppose, that they first Preached in those Countries which nearly adjoined to *Judea*, and thence proceeded by degrees to Countries at a greater distance, ^e as we find St. Paul did: And that they did it on this Reason, that being not too far dispersed, they might meet together at *Jerusalem* on Solemn stated times, and on particular Occasions, to consider and manage the great Affairs of the Church, of which under Christ they were the Supreme Governors: As they did a little after, *Acts* 15. to decide the Case concerning the Gentile Believers Submission to the Jewish Rites. For when the Apostles were dispersed, each of them were Subject to the Apostolic College, to which was made as in the Case named, the ultimate Appeal in Ecclesiastical Affairs.

The Church of *Jerusalem* being the Mother Church, over which the Apostles had so long jointly presided, and to which they were to make their Resort; they could not but be concerned for its Welfare, to effect which they saw the Necessity of ap-

^d *Acts* 16. 9.

^e *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 37.*

pointing a Pastor to take care of its Peace and Felicity. Hence some time before their departure from it, in order to the enlarging of Christ's Dominions, they constituted St. James the Son of *Alphaus* or *Cleophas*, Bishop of that Church. He is called *Gal. 1. 19. our Lord's Brother*, or, as that Word often signifies, his near Kinsman: And it is probable, that, as after his Death (as will be shewn) there was a special Regard had to that Relation, in the choice of the Person who was to succeed him; so there might be a great Respect to it, when the Apostles made choice of St. James for this Station. That he was the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*, the universal Consent of the Antients give us sufficient ground to assure us; especially when so agreeable to what the Holy Scriptures deliver concerning him. *Eusebius* tells us "that the Throne was preserved unto his time, "of this James the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who "did receive his Episcopacy from our Saviour "and his Apostles. *Eusebius* tells us not from whom he received this Tradition. But he doth that other l. 2. which he had from *Clemens Alexandrinus*. For after he had told us "that James was the first that sat "in the Episcopal Throne in *Jerusalem*, he adds, "that *Clemens* reports that *Peter* and *James*, (*viz.* the "Son of *Zebedee*) and *John*, tho' they had received "a peculiar respect from our Lord, would not assume this Honour to themselves, but chose James "the just Bishop of *Jerusalem*. Both these Traditions declare St. James the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and the last, that he was chosen by *Peter*, *James* and *John*, no doubt with the consent of the rest: But

¹ Euseb. H. E. l. 7. c. 19. Τὸν Ἰακώβου θρόνον ἡ πόλις καὶ ἡ Ἱερουσολύμων ἐκκλησία καὶ ἡ ἐπισκοπὴ πρὸς τὸν Σωτῆρα καὶ τὸν Ἀποστόλων ἀποδεξαμένης εἰς δεύρον πεφυλαγμένην.

² Κλήμης—ἐν ἐκτῇ ἀπολυτώσει γεγραφών—Πέτρον φησὶ καὶ Ἰακώβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, ὡς αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν καὶ πάλιν περιλειπόμενος, μὴ ἐπιδικάζειν δόξην, ἀλλ' Ἰακώβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱερουσολύμων ἐλέγξει, Euseb. H. E. l. 2. c. 1.

possibly these are named, because being our Saviour's great Favourites, towards whom he shewed some marks of particular Respect, one of these might be judged fittest for that eminent Dignity: But that when proposed to them, all concurred in conferring it on St. James the Just, as being our Lord's Kinsman, and it may be, from some Intimation from our Lord himself, as is hinted in the first Citation. From the other St. James being one of the Electors, we may Collect somewhat concerning the time of St. James the Just's being Elected, viz. that it must be before the other St. James was Slain by Herod, and therefore some little time before the Expiration of the Apostles twelve Years stay at Jerusalem.

To these might be added other Testimonies of St. James's being the first Bishop of Jerusalem, out of other Fathers, had they not been formerly collected by Learned Persons; and among them by Blondel in his Preface to his Apology, p. 19. Who, being the Presbyterians great Champion, will not (I presume) be excepted against, especially when one of his Fathers is St. Jerom, who asserts this both in his *Chronicon* and his *Catalogue*. Among these that of Hegefippus, ^b who Lived so near the Apostles time, and made it his business to Collect the Practices of the Church, is unexceptionable.

Such Antient Testimonies ought not without just grounds to be rejected by us, much less when consonant to what is delivered in the Holy Scriptures. There we are told, *Acts* 12. 17. that St. Peter, after he had declared to the Christians, to whom he went, his miraculous Deliverance, he bids them go and shew these things to James and to the Brethren; which manifests St. James's Residence at Jerusalem, and supposes his Obligation to continue there, in order to take care of that Church, which was committed to

^b Euseb. H. E. l. i. c. 23. Blondel owns that the Fathers agree in this, Apol. p. 50.

his especial care. This is likewise intimated, *Gal. 2.* That when St. Paul, fourteen Years after his Conversion, that is two or three Years after the former time, went up to *Jerusalem*, there to confer with the Apostles; among these the *δοξῆνες* or *δοξίμοι*, the Eminent and such as were Pillars are there named; and among these James is set before Cephas and John, tho' two of those Apostles on whom Christ had put the greatest Honour: Which intimates the Dignity and Station he had then in that Church, and the Preference he had there before the two other eminent Apostles. Especially, if we add what is delivered *Acts 15.* where St. James's Authority and Superiority more plainly appears. For in that Council at *Jerusalem*, after St. Peter had declared his Judgment against obliging the Gentile Converts to observe the Jewish Rites, and St. Paul and St. Barnabas had declared what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them; then St. James speaks in the last Place, and having taken notice what had been before spoken, propounds what ought to be Decreed; and according to his Determination, and in his Terms, the Decree was Enacted. Which shews that he had the Precedence and Primacy in the Council, and may be a good Reason to induce us to believe him to be Bishop of that City, when we compare it with the Practice of the Bishops in the next Ages of the Church. Besides, when certain are said to come from James, *Gal. 2. 12.* that is, from the Church of *Jerusalem* to *Antioch*, this intimates that St. James was the chief of that Church: That whereas (*Acts 8. 14.*) we find that the Apostles in general whilst they resided at *Jerusalem*, are said to send Peter and John from thence to *Samaria*; here the Messengers are said to be sent from James, on whom the supreme Authority of that Church was devolved by the rest of the Apostles. And afterwards, *Acts 21.* When St. Paul came to *Jerusalem*, being desirous to impart the Success of his Labours

2

among

48 *An History of the Government*

among the Gentiles to the Christians of that City, v. 18. *he went in unto James*, as the Head of that Church, and with him *all the Presbyters*, as being next in Authority, *were present*, and concurred in giving Advice to *St. Paul*. Thus we have seen the Universal Tradition of the Church, delivered by the Antient Fathers, to be agreeable to what the Holy Scriptures have told us of *St. James*: Which, being as much as can reasonably be expected in a matter of so great Antiquity, we may with much Assurance conclude, that he was Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and placed there by the Apostles themselves. And *Eusebius* has given us the Names of the Bishops of *Jerusalem*, from *St. James* in a continued Succession; who, tho' he lived three Hundred Years after *St. James's* Election, and so his own Testimony is of no Validity, yet certainly deserves our notice, when he took it from the Antient Records of the Church, and other Authentic Monuments. Here I might observe that if there was any OEcumenical Bishop constituted by the Apostles, it was not *St. Peter* as the Romanists would have us believe, but *St. James*. But 'tis enough only to name this here.

Thus we have seen the first Christian Church, which was founded by the joint Ministry of the Holy Apostles, furnished with Deacons, Presbyters, and a Bishop set over them, and this Church (as I have shewn) vastly exceeding the Limits of one Congregation, and therefore *Diocesan Episcopacy* settled by the Apostles themselves: And without doubt, this being the Mother Church, to be a Precedent to other Churches: Which we may well conclude, when we have the Attestation of all Antient Monuments, that all other Churches were afterwards modelled according to this Pattern, as will appear in the sequel of this History. By the Ministry of this first Bishop, as *Hegesippus* tells

tell
" i
" e
" c
" c
" t
" c
titu
cen
man
con
gat
cou
of t
gre
this
T
Jern
wer
beca
es:
plan
we n
find
Wri
who
larly
their
could
reaso
gatin
preac
fake
them
Lette
Bisho
rinth
Euse

tells us, ^a "this Church was so vastly enlarged by
 "the Accession of Multitudes of Believers, yea,
 "even (*ἀρχόντων*) of the Rulers or Principal Men of
 "the City, that it produced an Uproar of the Jews,
 "of the Scribes and Pharisees, they being afraid
 "that the whole City would own *Jesus* for the
 "Christ. Which by the way, considering the Mul-
 "titude of Converts immediately after Christ's As-
 "cension, three Thousand, five Thousand, &c. plainly
 manifests the unreasonableness of them, who would
 confine the Church of *Jerusalem* to a single Congre-
 gation, as if one Congregation in so great a City
 could give any grounds to them to fear the Revolt
 of the whole City; or that one, or indeed ten Con-
 gregations of Christians could make them suspect
 this, where there were hundreds of Synagogues.

Tho' a Bishop was thus set over the Church of
Jerusalem, yet it was some time after, before Bishops
 were introduced into other Churches; and that,
 because the blessed Apostles governed other Church-
 es: In which Government the Apostle, who
 planted the Church, had the chiefest concern, as
 we may Collect from St. *Paul's* Epistles; where we
 find him exercising Authority in the Churches he
 Writes to, but especially challenging it in those
 who were converted by his Ministry: As particu-
 larly in that of *Corinth*, where he speaks to 'em as
 their Father and Founder. ^b With whom tho' he
 could not hold constant Personal Communion (by
 reason of his care over other Churches, his propa-
 gating the Gospel where it had not been before
 preached, as also being often a Prisoner for Christ's
 sake; nor on the like Accounts could come among
 them in his circular Visitation;) yet he sends his
 Letters to 'em, and therein his Injunctions as their
 Bishop, censures the Scandalous, Cautions the *Co-*
rinthians against Schismatics and false Teachers, and

^a Eusebius *H. E.* li. 2. c. 23. ^b 1 *Cor.* 9. 2. 1. *Cor.* 4. 19.

50 *An History of the Government*

asserts his own Authority, which some had lessened. Tho' withal, each Apostle had a general Authority in, and concern for the whole Church; as appears by the actings of the Apostles in Churches that were not converted by themselves: As in the Church of *Samaria*, converted by *Philip* the Deacon; for thither *St. Peter* and *St. John* were sent by the rest of the Apostles; and in that of *Antioch*, converted by some of them who were dispersed from *Jerusalem*.^c Further, the Apostles exerted their Authority not only towards *Laics*, but also over Officers in the Church, both over *Presbyters*, and even *Prophets* themselves. We find *St. Paul* laying Injunctions, and enacting Canons for the Churches to observe, and this in things not commanded by Christ. This he doth in respect to married and unmarried Persons; *1 Cor.* 7. 2, 5, 10, 11, 12, 17. He adds *so ordain I* (*ὣς ἀγορεύω*) an Authoritative Expression, (used likewise, *1 Cor.* 11. 34.) in all the Churches. He likewise *2 Thess.* 3. 4, 6, 10, 12. thus Writes, *We command you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw your selves from every Brother that walketh disorderly, &c. We command that with quietness they eat their own bread.* He also (*1 Cor.* 14) prescribes Rules for them who had extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit, Prophets and Spiritual Persons, how they should demean themselves in the Exercise of their Spiritual Gifts. He withal exercised Discipline, first in denouncing a Sentence of *Excommunication* against the incestuous Person, *1 Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. And when it had produced a happy effect in humbling and reforming the Excommunicate Persons, and deterring others by his Example; he reverses the Sentence, and *Absolves* the Penitent Offender, *2 Cor.* 2. 6, 7. Had there been any in that Church invested with Power to execute Discipline, the Apostle would have put them on inflicting these

^c Of this see more in *Dr. Potter of the Rights of the Church* p. 98.

Censures. I might have shewn also how he Excommunicated *Hymenæus*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. whose Crime, and probably the reason of his Punishment, is mentioned 2 *Tim.* 2. 17, 18. Omitting other Acts of Government exercised by the Apostles, I shall only instance in that of ordaining Persons to the sacred Ministry. Besides that of ordaining Deacons, of which before, we find, *Acts* 14. 23. that *Paul* and *Barnabas* ordained Elders in every Church; that *Timothy* received the Gift by the imposition of St. *Paul's* Hands, who was not the least of the Apostles, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. probably by the concurrent laying on the Hands of the Presbytery, to which the Practice of our Church is conformable. Tho' *ἐκκλησία* may denote an Assembly of the Apostles themselves, especially if *Timothy* was thereby invested with Apostolic Authority. Before I dismiss this, 'tis observable, that the Apostles exercised this Power not only over the Laity, but also over Church Officers, viz. the Prophets and *Pneumatici* at *Corinth*, and the Presbyters at *Ephesus*, *Acts* 20. 17, &c. whom he not only sent for and called to *Miletus*, but also with an Air of Superiority minds of their Duty, and gives them a Solemn charge not to neglect it: So also that they continued to govern Churches where Presbyters were placed, as well as those that wanted them; as is evident in respect to the Church at *Philippi*, in which there were not only Deacons, but also Presbyters; (for I shall freely yield that by the Word *ἐπισκόποις* they are to be understood, *Phil.* 1. 1. As also, *Acts* 20. 28. by the same Word, which we Translate Over-seers.) For (as Dr. *Potter* observes, " they still remained under " St. *Paul's* Government, when he wrote his Epistle " to them, from his taking Maintenance from them; " this being an Ordinance of our Saviour's own Appointment, that they who preach the Gospel, should

^a Disc. of Church-government, p. 122. Where see more.

52 *An History of the Government*

“ *live of the Gospel.* I would observe further, that as other Apostles, as such, were invested with equal Authority with *S. Paul*; so they were equally concerned in the Government of the Church, and by parity of Reason exercised Authority accordingly: Of which we have an Instance in *St. John. 2 John 10. 11.* where he commands the Christians he wrote to, to avoid familiarity with, and common Civilities to, such as brought not the true Christian Doctrine with them: And *3 John 9. 10.* by his censuring of *Diotrephes*. Of which more afterwards.

But all this while we do not find that the Apostles committed any of that Power to local *Presbyters*, or that at any time they exercised it. Particularly *Acts 20.* Where *St. Paul* speaks to the *Presbyters* of *Ephesus*, and minds them of their Duty; we find not that he intrusts them with any Power of Government, Execution of Discipline, or of ordaining. If this should have been granted to them, this time, when the Apostle is solemnly bidding them farewell, knowing that they should see his Face no more, would have been a fit Season for him to have granted a larger extent of Power, or if they formerly had it in their Commission; when ordained to that Office, to put them on the management of that Power, when he was leaving them; and that he should declare that he institutes them in the full Exercise of all parts of Church-government, which hitherto he had kept in his own Hands. But here is nothing of this nature: He only with comfort reflects on his own deportment among them, puts them on a strict care of discharging their Duty in watching over their Flock, cautions them against the Wolves that would endeavour to make a prey of them, and concludes with an affectionate farewell. But here is nothing of those Commands concerning Ordination to sacred Offices, or Execution of Discipline, or other Acts of Government, which he gives to *Timothy* and *Titus* in his Epistles written to them, (of which more in it's Place) nor any thing else but what belonged to their Office as simple *Presbyters*.

Neither do we at any time find mere *Presbyters* exercising any of those Acts of Government: What is pretended of that kind, I shall now consider. The first of which is that in *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. where *Presbyters* may seem to be invested with Power of Ordination, in that a Command is given by the Holy Ghost to such, who are called *διδάσκαλοι Teachers*, that they should Separate *Barnabas* and *Saul* for the work whereunto he had called them. Upon which when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. But if we consider the several Circumstances of this Passage, here is nothing from which we can rationally deduce such an Inference, I mean either from the Persons who are set apart, the Persons impowered to do it, or the nature of the Command. The Persons separated were *Barnabas* and *Saul*, Persons who had been before this time employed in the sacred Ministry, the first ^e sent forth by the Church of Jerusalem to *Antioch*, to perfect what had been begun by others Preaching; in which *St. Paul* assisted him, who had before an extraordinary call to this sacred Office, and probably both of them to the Apostleship. However, if called here to any Office, it must be to the Office of *Apostles*, they being Teachers before: But it was not in the Power of Men to call them to that Office, there being absolutely requisite thereto an immediate Call from God himself, as *St. Paul* intimates in his arguing with the *Galatians*, and his styling himself ^f an *Apostle*, not of Men, neither by Man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father. Besides, there are two Ranks of Persons who are said to separate these; there were not only Teachers, but also *Prophets*, who were extraordinary Officers of that Age, and are reckoned ^g next to the *Apostles*, and often ^h joined with them as of the greatest Au-

^e *Acts* 11. 22, 25, 26.

^f *Gal.* 1. 1.

^g *Eph.* 4. 11.

^h *Eph.* 2. 20.

54 *An History of the Government*

thority in the Church of God; and hence nothing can be deduced for a Power in *Presbyters* to Ordain from this Place, when they only Act here in conjunction with superior Ministers. And as for *Imposition of Hands*, which was, and is still justly used as the Rite for Ordaining Persons to any sacred Ministry, and might induce any to suppose it used for that end in this Place; we must remember, that it was withal a Rite of solemn Benediction; and most likely it was here thus used, together with Fasting and Prayer, to implore a Blessing from Almighty God on the Labours of these Apostles, who were by the Direction of the Holy Ghost sent forth on that momentous Work of propagating the Gospel in divers Countries, which were hitherto Strangers to it. But lastly let us suppose this to be an Ordination, and performed only by *Presbyters*, neither of which are probable; nothing can be inferred from hence to make this a Precedent in ordinary Cases, and for future Ages; in that this was an immediate Revelation from God, an extraordinary Injunction of the Holy Ghost, a particular Call from Heaven, which is not now expected, or pretended to, by them who alledge this Instance to justify Ordination by *Presbyters*.

The next Instance wherein the Power of *Presbyters* in Governing, the Church is produced, is that in *Acts 15*. where in order to deciding the great Controversy, whether, and how far, Gentile-converts were obliged to observe *Mosaick Rites*, the Christians at *Antioch* sent not only to the *Apostles*, but also to the *Elders* about this Question v. 2. That the *Elders came together with the Apostles to consider of this matter*. v. 6. That the Decree it self runs in the Name of *the Apostles and Elders and Brethren*, v. 23. I shall not here argue that because *Brethren* are likewise named, that from hence even Lay-christians might equally challenge a share in making Canons for the Government of the Church; when
this

this is so satisfactorily answered by Dr. Potter,ⁱ
 " in that the Particle [*καί*] *and*, betwixt *Elders* and
 " *Brethren* v. 23. is left out in the most Antient
 " Manuscripts, and by the most Antient Fathers,
 " when they have occasion to cite this Place; and
 " so the Decree runs *Elders-Brethren*, and signifies
 " no more than Christian Presbyters, answerable to
 " the like Expressions in the New Testament; that
 " the Decree is afterwards, *ch.* 16. 4. said to be
 " *ordained only by the Apostles and Elders*; that the
 " *Layety* gave no Authority to the Decree; that the
 " *Layety* at *Jerusalem* had no Authority over them
 " at *Antioch*; that the Governors of the Church
 " have Authority to make Laws for the People
 " without asking their Consent, &c. to which I
 refer the Reader. Omitting this, I shall consider
 what Power *Presbyters* may challenge from this Place.
 'Tis not denied, but that they may join with the
 Bishops in making Canons, and that they were in
 the first times of Counsel to the Bishop; that they
 were present in Synods, as such who knew the
 concerns of the Church, and what might be fit to
 be enacted for its Welfare; and that their Consent
 might be asked, that matters might be decreed with
 unanimity; and particularly in this Council at *Jerusalem*
 shew the universal concurrence of that Church
 in this Decree, in order to induce the Jewish Christians
 at *Antioch* and elsewhere, to the readier compliance,
 when they found that all the Church of *Jerusalem*,
 who were all *so zealous of the Law*^k concurred
 with the Apostles in this Determination. Which may
 be a Reason, why the *Brethren* are also added,
 supposing them to be in the original Decree. But
 this doth not conclude that either the *Brethren* or
Presbyters had decisive Voices in this, or any other
 Council, or that the Decree received it's Authority
 from their Concurrence: No more than any Royal

ⁱ Disc. of Church-government, p. 333. 334.

^k Acts 21. 20.

Proclamation with us, because it was decreed in Council, and has the Names of the Privy Counsellors that were present prefixed to it, receives it's Authority from them, and not from the Sovereign by whom it was enacted. Neither doth the Church of *England* grant less Authority to *Presbyters*; in that the lower house of Convocation, which consists of *Presbyters*; always joyn with the *Bishops* in making Canons: And are in many other Cases interested in the Government of the Church; as in the Vacancy of a See, till a Bishop is chosen (as was formerly in *St. Cyprian's* Days, of which his Epistles give us Instances.) And not only *then*, but also at other times in Subordination to the Bishop. As in *repelling* notorious evil Livers, and malicious injurious Persons from the Holy Communion. As appears in the *Rubricks* before that Office, and in the *Twenty Sixth Canon*. But hence none can fairly infer that they have a sole, or superior Power to make Laws for the Government of the Church, or to exercise any Government of themselves, but only in Subordination to the Bishop; much less that they are invested with Power to Ordain.

Before I proceed further, I shall observe, that this Concession, that in those first times there were no where any Bishops placed except in the Church of *Jerusalem*, and that other Churches were governed by the Apostles themselves, and by Presbyters acting and presiding therein under the Apostles, doth not at all hurt the cause of Episcopacy, but rather Establishes it: In that particular Churches, as that at *Philippi*, had Deacons, Presbyters, and over these that Apostle; that was the Founder of the Church (or however the College of the Apostles) as their Governor; in the room of whom, at the latter end of the Apostles Days, Bishops were placed to succeed them in the Government; of whom (besides the Bishop of *Jerusalem*) there is no reason to expect any Account in the History of the Acts of the Apostles, when

when during all that time the Apostles reserved the Government of the Church in their own Hands, and had not as yet committed it to Successors. Besides, when we find one Apostle, as St. Paul governed many Churches, and these at a great distance from each other; this shews the unreasonableness of them, who will admit of no Bishop but a Governor of a single Congregation; and argue against the Government of the Church of *England*, as unlawful, because of the largeness of our Dioceses; when we find one Apostle, as St. Paul, governed and executed Discipline in a more extensive Circuit than any of our Diocesses, and indeed of our Provinces. The same may be rationally concluded of St. Peter, viz. that he had all those Churches under his Pastoral care, to whom he directs his first Epistle. to the Elect (the Christians) Strangers of the Dispersion, who tho' Jews by Extraction, yet were scattered throughout, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bythinia; a district of larger Extent, I say not only than the greatest of our Diocesses, or of the whole Province of *Canterbury*, but of the Kingdom of *Great Britain* it self. Which should caution some Men to use greater Charity than they usually do, whilst they condemn our Bishops as Criminals, for taking on them the care of Diocesses, or of larger districts than particular Congregations; and on this Reason think their Separation from them to be justifiable.

It must indeed be owned, that it would have been highly beneficial to our Church, had *Henry* the Eighth proceeded as he began, in erecting some new Bishopricks, and dividing our larger Dioceses, by which he would have cleared himself from the charge of Sacrilege, if (after his return of Improvements to the Rectors) he had settled the rest of the Revenues of the Church, which had been before misapplied, in endowing New Sees, as well as in some other pious Foundations. By this he would have

58 *An History of the Government*

have rendred the Province of those Bishops that have large Districts, as well as of the Clergy and People under them, more easy.

CHAP. V.

Of the Government of the Church towards the latter end of the Lives of the Apostles.

THUS for some time the Government of the Church was managed by the Apostles themselves. But afterwards, when by the Blessing of God the Dominions of Christ were enlarged, and his Church of a larger Extent, they found it requisite to communicate this Apostolical Power to Persons who had accompanied them in their Travels, assisted them in lower Ministries, and hereby became qualified for greater Trusts. Of this kind we have Instances of Two, viz. St. Timothy and St. Titus, to whom St. Paul communicated this Power; to the first he committed the Government of the Church of *Ephesus*, ¹ the *Metropolis* of the *Lydian Asia*, and therefore probably the Churches under it's Jurisdiction; to the latter, the Churches of *Crete*; ^m and in both to Exercise that Power, by ordaining Persons to sacred Offices, inflicting Censures on Offenders, and other the like Acts of Government; as is evident from the Epistles he wrote to each of them, in which he gives them Directions how they should Act in the Provinces committed to them. These are of the number of the ἐλλογιμοί, ⁿ those eminent Persons, Men highly esteemed, whom St. Cle-

¹ 1 Tim. 1. 3.

^m Tit. 1. 5.

ⁿ οἱ ἐν λόγῳ, qui scil. magni habebantur, qui infimi ordinis hominibus opponebantur, qui ἐδ' ἐν λόγῳ ἐδ' ἐν δειθμῶ. v. Cl. Dodwell; *Paran.* p. 33.

men
ch.
who
con
the
was
but
and
be u
his
his
be ri
dain
ther
he is
being
to D
fore
recei
And
is ev
5. 19
shoul
if he
Sente
whic
with
wise
there
struc
byter
own
witho
of P
name

o I
I 2
Apollos

mens mentions in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, ch. 44. and by the Apostle called his *ὑπερστοι*, by whom, as well as by the Apostles, Presbyters were constituted in Churches. As for *Timothy*, we find the extent of his Authority in respect to Persons, was over all, not only those in a private Station, but also over ^o *Deacons*, ^p *Widows* or *Deaconesses*, and even ^q *Presbyters* themselves, whom I own to be understood by *ἐπίσκοποι*. In respect to the Parts of his Office, not only to Teach, and even Command his Flock, and to see that the Worship of God should be rightly and orderly celebrated; but also to ^r *Ordain* those, who had the Qualifications requisite thereto, and which he there prescribes, of which he is made sole Judge, to sacred Offices; to *Judge*, being entrusted with a Power to Examine, and thence to Determine in Causes that should be brought before him: Which is evident, in that he was *not* to receive an *Accusation*, but before two or three *Witnesses*; And to *Judge* even *Elders* or *Presbyters* themselves, as is evident from the same Place, *καὶ ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. Tho' with that precaution that the charge should be attested by more than one *Witness*; and if he might receive it, consequently he might pass Sentence, and inflict Censures accordingly. All which are a sufficient Proof, that he was invested with greater Power than that of a *Presbyter*: Otherwise why should St. Paul send him thither, when there were already Presbyters in that Church to instruct, &c? What Authority had he as a single *Presbyter* to judge a *Presbyter*; especially to do it by his own single Authority, (as he is here impower'd,) without any other Person, any *Presbyter* or College of *Presbyters* joined with him in Judgment? I'll name but one further Branch of Power, and that

^o 1 *Tim.* 3. 8.

^p 1 *Tim.* 5. 9.

^q 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2.

^r 1 *Tim.* 3. 10. 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. If *λόγισται* may signify the same, *Apollos* might be one of them, *Acts* 18. 24.

was his being entrusted to take care for a due Maintenance of those, who were employed in any sacred Ministry. 2 Tim. 2. 6. *The Husbandman that labour-eth must be first partaker of the Fruits.* And a care that an Allowance should be proportioned to their Employment. 1 Tim. 5. 17. *Let the Elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine:* The word [τιμή] which we translate *Honour* signifying *Maintenance*, as is observed by Dr. Hammond, and other learned Persons, and is thus used Acts 28. 10. Now the care of the distribution of the Patrimony of the Church, was one great part of the Office of the Apostles, (as afterwards of the Bishops) at ' whose Feet the Prices of the Lands, which the first Christians sold was deposited: Which is fully handled by ' a very learned Person, to whom I refer the Reader. The same Power was committed to Titus, whom St. Paul left in Crete to discharge the same Offices. For as he is commanded to Teach all sorts of Men their Duties, " to stop the Mouths of Deceivers, to Rebuke such sharply, and to Rebuke with all Authority: So he is required to " Admonish Hereticks, and if not reclaimed after the first and second Admonition, to reject them, that is, to shut them out of the Church's Communion; to set in order [ἐπιτάξαι] to regulate, and perfect in the Churches of Crete what St. Paul had left imperfect (by reason of his care of all other Churches, and his work of propagating the Gospel,) which implies great Authority; but especially, as he is appointed to Ordain Elders in every Church, concerning which he gives him many Rules, chiefly in respect to the Qualifications of the Persons to be ordained, of which he makes him, as he had done Timothy, the Judge: This, and other Acts of Government he wholly

^c Acts 4. 37.

^e Mr. Dodwell in his *Parænesis*, §. 30.

^u Tit. 1. 11, 12. Tit. 2. 15.

^w Tit. 3. 10.

intrusts

intrusts with both of these, as single Persons, never joining Presbyters, or any Assembly of them, in the Exercise of those Offices, with these secondary Apostles. And particularly as for the Power of *Ordaining*, we may conclude it to be a peculiar Prerogative of the Apostles, and of them who should succeed them in the Government of the Church; in that we find it only committed to *Timothy* and *Titus* by *St. Paul*, without the least Intimation of Presbyters having any Right thereto, either as Originally in their Office, or by being by the Apostle invested with it, in the Epistles to either of them, in which he largely treats of the Office; and indeed, had this Power belonged to Presbyters, here we might have expected some mention of it. *

From these Powers committed to these two Eminent Persons, Antient Writers of the Church have styled *Titus* Bishop of *Crete*, and *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus*, these being the Places where they exercised them. For tho' the Subscriptions of the Epistles where they are thus named, were inserted by *Euthalius*, four Hundred Fifty Eight Years after Christ; † yet no doubt 'twas then an Antient Tradition of the Church, and is thus mentioned some time before in the Council of *Chalcedon*. Now tho' this is objected against, on this Reason, because their Residence in those as Bishops is consistent with their Attendance on *St. Paul* in his Travels, in which *St. Timothy* is joined with him in his Epistles to the *Thessalonians*, the *Philippians*, and the second to the *Corinthians*, which were written from several Places, where he accompanied him; and there are some Passages in the New Testament which induce us to think the same of *St. Titus*: Yet when the Epistles to these Eminent fellow-Labourers of *St. Paul* were Written some time after the Epistles now mentioned, and

* Parker's Government 600 Years p. 51.

† v. Cl. Millii Prolegom. in N. T.

probably after the time wherein the History of the Acts of the Apostles ends, as appears by the Times, as digested by the Learned Primate *Usher* in his Annals, this solves the Objection.

What has been offered to prove that *Timothy* did not continue his Abode at *Ephesus*, where he is commanded (*προσμεῖναι*) to abide, nor *Titus* in *Crete*, is insufficient to convince us. But however, granting this, that these Persons did not continually reside in these Places whither they were delegated by the Blessed Apostle, but might possibly be employed in the same sacred Ministries in other Places; as *Timothy* was called to *Rome*, and *Titus* was sent to *Dalmatia*; ² 'tis evident that they were invested with Episcopal Power, with a Right to Ordain, and to Exercise other Acts of Government in the Churches to which they were sent, in Subordination to the Apostles; which Presbyters have no Right to Exercise, and which Bishops now justly Challenge as appropriated to their Order. So that it matters not, especially during the Lives of the Apostles, tho' they continued not in the Places to which they were sent as their fixed Station. *Rabanus Maurus* observes that these were not as Bishops were afterwards placed over particular Cities, but over whole Provinces.

And as these Two, so there is just Ground to think, that there were several others, who at that time received the same Power from the Apostles, and exercised it in the Churches to which they were sent. Such was *Epaphroditus*, whom as *St. Paul* (*Phil. 2. 25.*) calls his Brother, Fellow-labourer and Fellow-soldier, whom we find, under the name of *Epaphras*, imploied in teaching the *Colossians. Col. 1. 7.* so also called the Apostle of the *Philippians*, accounted therefore by *Theodoret*, on *1 Tim. 3.* Bishop of *Philippi*. Such *Sosthenes*, *Crescens*, and *Apollos*, such

² 2 *Tim. 4. 9. 20.*

like
17.
he
Mr.
whic
an A
treph
he w
this
taxed
Churc
meer
Preer
fecter
excee
[λόγ
babbl
(or if
Autho
invest
he der
sequio
of Chr
Person
Epistle
and pa
stians i
tioned,
and wh
Cognis
tions of
this fro
St. John
entertai
these M
the Offi

* v. Pa
Euseb. H

likewise *Archippus*, (whom *St. Paul* mentions *Col. 4. 17.* and charges to take heed to the Ministry which he had received of the Lord) is supposed to be by *Mr. Dodwell*.^a There is an Instance of another, which I shall consider because insisted on by some^b as an Argument against Episcopacy, and that is *Diotrephes*, mentioned *3 John 9.* It is very likely that he was one to whom the Apostles had committed this Authority, tho' he abused it, and for that is taxed by *St. John*: In that he did cast some out of the Church, *v. 10.* which he had no Right to do as a meer Presbyter. To him therefore [*πρωτεία*] a Preeminence was due, but he was too great an Affecter of it, and an ill manager of it, in which he exceeded his bounds: Especially, when he did [*λόβοις πονηροῖς φλυαρεῖν*] with malicious Speeches babble and prate against us [*ἡμᾶς*] the very Apostles, (or if we with *Dionysius of Alexandria* suppose the Author of this Epistle another *John*, yet he was one invested with Apostolick Authority,) towards whom he demeaned himself with less Reverence and Obsequiousness than was due to the supreme Governours of Christ's Church. 'Tis conjectured by a Learned Person,^c that this *Gaius*, to whom *St. John's* third Epistle is Written, was a Presbyter of the Church, and particularly concerned in entertaining Christians in their Travels: (may he not be *Gaius* mentioned, *Rom. 16. 23.* ὁ ξένος μὲν καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὄλης;) and when some, who had the *Symbola Hospitalitatis*, Cognisances of their being Christians, and Indications of their Right to be entertained as such, and this from the Apostles themselves, at least from *St. John*, came to *Diotrephes*; he not only refused to entertain them, but also forbad *Gaius* to do it. But these Men are ill furnished with Arguments against the Office of Bishops, who on this reason condemn it,

^a *v. Paranes. §. 11. p. 42.*
Euseb. H. E. l.

^b *Blond. p. 15.*

^c *Cl. Dodwelli Paran. Ibid.*

because

like-

64 *An History of the Government*

because one preferred to it, acted insolently, and transcended his bounds in the discharge of it. Tho' the Persons of such deserve to be severely censured; yet the Office it self ought not to suffer, much less be rejected, nor the faithful dischargers of it the less honoured: No more than Judas's being a Traitor detracts from the Office of an Apostle, or lessens it's eminent Dignity.

^d Here I shall observe what is intimated by that Eminent Person in the Church, St. Clement, (whom St. Paul, *Phil.* 4. 3. numbers among his *Fellow-Labourers, whose Names are in the Book of Life*) of the ministerial Offices in the Church, in his excellent Epistle Written in the name of the Church of Rome, of which he was Bishop, to the Church of Corinth. It was Written after the Martyrdom of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, whom he mentions *ch.* 5. among [*ἐγτίσα γινόμενους ἀθλήτας*] very late Champions in the cause of Christ; yet before the Destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem, which he intimates to be then standing, when *Chap.* 41. he saith, *that the daily Sacrifices, Sin-offerings, &c. are not offered up* [*προσφέρονται*] in the present Tense, in every place, but in Jerusalem only, and not in any place there, but at the Altar, before the [*ναὸς*] Sanctuary, (strictly called the Temple) the Sacrifice being first viewed by the High Priest, &c. ^e And hence that it was Written very early, whilst several of the Apostles were Alive, and therefore of great Authority. The occasion of the writing this Epistle was a New Schism in the Church of Corinth, about Twelve Years after that Schism, for which St. Paul blamed them in his first Epistle to that Church. What occasioned that Schism must be deduced from some Passages in the Epistle it's self. The *Pneumatici*, Persons to whom God had vouchsafed spiritual Gifts,

^d This Epistle with other Apostolick Writers, is translated into English by Bishop Wake. ^e v. Cl. Dodwell's Dissertat.

had been Guilty of great Disorders in the management thereof in the time of God's publick Worship, before this ; for which they are blamed by St. Paul, 1 Cor. 12. This (as has been noted) was probably before ordinary Ministers were settled among them. Since that time after Presbyters were settled in that Church, some one or two, [ἀρχηγοί] the Ring-leaders of those gifted Persons did [σάσιαζεν πρὸς πρεσβυτέρους] raise a Sedition, instigate others against the Presbyters, and in a disorderly manner remove, and cast some of them from their Station, ch. 44. in exhorting with these, he shews that their [γνώσις] gift of knowledge aggravated their Crime, a Crime greater than that for which St. Paul (whose Epistle he bids them take into their Hands) taxed them ; because they then express a due Veneration and Affection for the Apostles. ch. 47. But now they acted otherwise, in that they set themselves against the Presbyters, Persons who had been ordained either by the Apostles themselves, or those [ἐλλόγιμοι] Eminent Men who were empower'd by the Apostles to that Eminent Station. By the way we may observe, that Presbyters received not their Authority from other Presbyters, who had no Authority to Ordain, but from the Apostles or the ἐλλόγιμοι. St. Clement proceeds, in advising such who had caused the Schism to withdraw, that Christ's Flock might enjoy Peace with the Presbyters that were set over them ; that hereby they would express much Christian generosity ; and bids them, that had laid the Foundation of this Schism, to live in Subjection to the Presbyters. Ch. 57. That it would not justify them, because they had the Gifts of [πίστις, γνώσις, σοφία, ἑξουσιᾶς λόγων.] Faith, Knowledge, Wisdom, &c. if they wanted Humility, Self-denial and Charity, of which he shews the excellent Fruits, and particularly that of making Men Peaceable. Ch. 48. 49. In order to prepare them for this Christian Temper, he had before shewn them the necessity and excel-

66 *An History of the Government*

lency of Piety, Love, Peace, Concord and Order ; and the abominable nature of Contention, Obloquy, Malice and the like Vices ; and the Necessity of Subjection to our spiritual military Officers in our Christian Warfare, answerably to the Subjection there is in an Army to their Leaders, and in all to their General ; and illustrates this by the Subordination there is of the Members of our natural Bodies to each other, and in all to the Head. *Ch. 37.* Having largely premised these things, he (*Ch. 40.*) brings it home to their own case ; and in order to direct how each of them should behave themselves, and keep within their proper Station, he shews the several Ranks there were in the Jewish Church, (according to which Pattern Christ modelled his own in many respects, either by himself or his Apostles :) *We considering seriously the depths of the Divine Knowledge, ought to do every thing in due Order, as our Lord hath commanded us to perform, to offer up our Oblations and [λεϊτουργίας] Ministrations [or Sacrifices] at the Times [appointed.]* And then a little after. *For there are proper Ministries [or Services] appointed for the High Priest ; and a proper place* [or Office] ordered for the Priests ; and proper Services [or Ministrations] are incumbent on the Levites ; and the Lay-man is bound [or confined] to Duttes proper to a Lay Station. Let every one of you, Brethren, offer his oblation of Thanks to God, in his own Rank, continuing [therein] with a good Conscience in all gravity, not transcending the determined Limit of his Service.* St. Clement here teaches the Corinthians the Subordination there ought to be in the Christian Church, by representing and alluding to that which was in the Jewish Church.

* Clem. Epist. c. 40. Τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τῷ δεσπότῃ ἀκολουθεῖν καὶ διαμαρτυρεῖν. Τῷ γὰρ Ἀρχιερεὶ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομένα εἰσὶ καὶ τοῖς Ἱερεῦσιν ἰδίᾳ ὁ τόπος προσέλαχαι. καὶ τοῖς Λαΐταις ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπιτελεῖν ὁ Λαϊκὸς ἀνδρωπὸς τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προσάψμασιν δέδεσθαι. Ἐκαστὸς ὑμῶν—ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι ἐν χαλεπαίνῃ Θεῷ. κ. λ.

It
Bij
H
go
to
nex
min
Lev
W
Chu
of S
Deg
wro
serv
the
to
ther
as in
obse
or in
to th
any,
or in
in a S
cerni
at th
than
here's
from
Office
to eac
would
deserv
to mal
insulti
these
" as C
" Fath
" Pres

It is, as if he had said, the *Apostles*, and so the *Bishops*, who do and shall succeed them, have as the *High priest* among the Jews, the supreme Office in governing the Church; the *Presbyters*, answerable to the Jewish *Priests* of the second Order, have the next Place to the Bishops; the *Deacons* their Administration in an inferior Ministry, resembling the Levites, by which name they are often called in the Writings of the Fathers; and under these, in both Churches, the *Laity*. For this must be the meaning of *St. Clement*, in that having recounted those several Degrees or Ranks, he charges them to whom he wrote, that each of them should conscientiously observe his proper Rank, and not exceed his *ἡμετέριον*, the prescribed Limit, Path, Line or Station allotted to him; intimating, that in the *Christian Church* there was a Subordination of Ecclesiastical Offices, as in the *Jewish Church*, which all were obliged to observe; and that none ought to exceed his Bounds, or intrude into such Functions which belonged not to the Station wherein he was placed; nor ought any, that was in an Inferior Rank, usurp the Places, or intrude into the Employments of them who were in a Superior Office. Tho' we are at a loss concerning the particular Usurpations and Disorders at this time in the Church of *Corinth*, any farther than what may be collected out of this Epistle; yet here's clear Evidence of the distinction of the *Laity* from the *Clergy*, and in the *Clergy* the distinction of Offices before enumerated, with their Subordination to each other; and the great fault of them who would not observe it, which is here severely and deservedly taxed by *St. Clement*: Who, in order to make the Schismatic's sensible of their Sin in their insulting the Presbyters, shews (*Ch. 42.*) from whom these Presbyters received their Authority: "That as *Christ* received his Authority from God the Father, the *Apostles* theirs from *Christ*, so these Presbyters who were [*ἀπαρχαί*] the first Fruits

68 *An History of the Government*

“ or first Converts] were appointed (after a trial
 “ of them by the Holy Spirit) for Overseers and
 “ Deacons of them who should embrace the Chri-
 “ stian Faith, by the *Apostles*. By these, and not
 by the *People*, who were to be taught and governed
 by them. And then (*Ch. 44*) tells them what ^s Law
 the *Apostles* gave for providing Successors, when
 these Ministers should Dye, viz. that other appro-
 ved Persons should be constituted in their room,
 either by the *Apostles*, or other (ἐλλόγιμοι) Excel-
 lent Persons (of whom before;) the Laity's part be-
 ing only an ^h *Approbation* of them, and giving *Testi-*
mony of their former Conversation. Here I must
 consider a Passage in *Chap. 54*. Which seems to give
 the *People* Authority in Church-affairs, and has been
 made use of by some to that purpose. When *St. Cle-*
ment exhorts them that had been tumultuous to con-
 descend, and bids them say, *I'll be gone, I'll with-*
draw, it follows τοῖσι τὰ πρεσβυτέρω ὑπὸ τῷ πλῆ-
 θυν, mistranslated by the learned *Mr. Patric Young*,
faciam quæ à plebe mandantur, i. e. *I'll do what is*
commanded by the People. But this shadow of an
Argument for the *Peoples* Power will disappear,
 when we consider (1) that *St. Clement*, when he
 speaks of the *People*, as distinguished from the *Cler-*
gy, names them not πλῆθος but λαόν or λαῖκός.
 But especially when (2) πλῆθος here will admit
 of another signification, and more agreeable to the
 Author's design, viz. the majority of the *Clergy*,
 the greater number of *Christ's* Ministers in the Church
 of *Corinth*, the καθεσταμένοι πρεσβύτεροι, those *Pres-*
byters that were settled among them, with whom the
Flock of Christ was to be in Peace; which follows after
 the former Passage: Especially when this (πλῆθος)

^s Of the importance of the Word ἐπνομή, see *Mr. Dodwell's*
Paranef. §. 10. p. 36. & *fac. Ardennæ Conjectura circa ἐπνομήν*
D. Clementis Rom.

^h Συμβολοποιήσεως τῆ ἐκκλησίας μεμαρτυρημένους πολλοῖς
 χερίνοις ὑπὸ πάντων.

multitude

multitude or Majority is spoken in opposition to those *Few* who occasioned the sedition, it being raised ἐν ἡ δύο πρόσωπα, by one or two Persons. Chap. 42. And these Persons of little worth, ἄτιμοι, ἄδοξοι, ἀφρονες, νέοι. (Chap. 3.) Men of mean worth and esteem, imprudent and young, against ἐνλίμους, ἐνδόξους, φρονίμους, πρεσβυτέρους, Men that were of great Honour, Estimation, Wisdom and Years (tho' πρεσβύτεροι denotes Office as well as Age:) A majority of these latter, who so far exceeded the former both in Number and Qualifications may deservedly be styled πλεονέκτης in the Judgment of all unprejudiced Persons; and those having the highest Power in the Church, next the Apostles and their Successors, had a Right (πρωτάτλειαν) to order and direct the Affairs of the Church in a due Subordination to the Apostles, and also to their Bishop, if they had any then set over them.

But this brings me to consider *Blondel's* Objection against Episcopacy from the Inscription of this Epistle: That at this time there were no Bishops, because there is no mention of any Bishop of *Rome*, from which Church this Epistle was sent, nor of *Corinth*, to which it was sent. I answer (1) *Blondel's* Argument would equally prove that there was no Clergy at all in either of those Churches, because there is no mention of any in the Inscription: Because directed only from the Church of *Rome* to the Church of *Corinth*; that there were no Ministers, because not mention'd. (2) It was customary in those first Times for Churches to write to one another in such general terms, and in those Times, wherein *Blondel* himself owns that Bishops were settled in Churches; there's no mention of any Bishop in the Inscription, tho' there is in the Epistle it self, which evidences that the Churches were governed by Bishops. Thus it is in several Epistles recorded by *Eusebius* :

1 Euseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 23.

To the Church at *Gortyna*, in which their Bishop *Philip* is commended; to the Church at *Amasris*.^{*} The Servants of Christ at *Vienna* and *Lyons* to their Brethren in *Asia* and *Phrygia*, where their glorious Bishop *Photinus* is mention'd; omitting those of *Ignatius*, only directed to the Churches of *Smyrna* and *Trallis*, tho' there be mention of *Polycarp* the Bishop of the former, and of *Polybius* the Bishop of the latter Church in the Epistles. (3) *Ireneus*, who lived so near that time, could not discern the consequence, which *Blondel* represents as clear as the Noon-day.¹ He had seen this Epistle, gives us the occasion of it's being Written, and yet at the same time tells us, that *Clement* (τῷ ἐπισκοπῶν κληροδοτῶν) was Bishop of *Rome*. But lastly, supposing there was not, at the time when this Epistle was Written, any Bishop at *Corinth*; this hurts not the cause of Episcopacy, in that there was no necessity that there should then be any fixed Bishop placed there, whilst there were several Apostles alive to govern that and other Churches. Especially, if we consider that in all probability this Epistle was written immediately after the Death of *St. Paul*, (whom he speaks of as (ἐγγιστα) very lately a Champioun in Christ's cause *ch. 5.*) who was the Founder, and thence, while he lived, and before he had substituted any other, Governor of that Church; and hence no necessity so soon to find a Bishop settled there. Add to all this the unreasonableness of making this Epistle any way hurtful to this Cause, when *St. Clement* has herein (as I have shewn) so fully declared the Subordination of Officers in the Church of God. Any of which considerations, but especially all together, are enough to shew the extravagancy of *Blondell's* confidence, when, from the no mention of Bishops in the Inscription of the Epistle, he infers *luce meridianâ clarior elucescit, tunc temporis Ecclesias communi præposi-*

^{*} Id. l. 5. c. 1.

¹ Ibid c. 6. & *Iren.* l. 3. c. 3.

torum consilio gubernatas, non unius regimini, à cujus natu penderent omnes, subjacuisse.

Blondel from this Epistle ch. 42. where 'tis said that the Apostles did Ordain or Constitute their first Fruits καὶ ἡγῶνες καὶ πόλεις—εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ ἑλεγκόντας, infers (1) “that then that was not observed which “was afterwards decreed at *Sardica*, that Bishops “should not be placed in Villages. And withal, “that then there were but only two Orders of the “Clergy, viz. only Bishops, who were the same as “Presbyters, and Deacons. I shall consider this latter in the first Place. It might be answered probably that St. *Clement* thus expresses himself in allusion to the Text which immediately follows, taken out of *Esai.* 60. 17. which the Greek Translation, then used, reads καλᾶσῃσω τὰς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τὰς ἑλεγκόντας ἐν πίστει. Especially if we add, that under the name *Episcopus*, as that of *Sacerdos*, both Offices might be comprehended, when many things belong to both Offices; as is shewn in the Preface. But the reason of St. *Clement*'s expressing himself thus, will easily appear by considering his design in this Place. He is vindicating the Presbyters, who had been so rudely treated by the Schismatic's: This gives him occasion to speak of the Institution of Presbyters: This he shews was done by the Apostles themselves, who upon planting Churches ordained both the Offices of Presbyters and Deacons. For I understand by ἐπισκόπους Presbyters, as St. *Paul* generally uses that Word in his Epistles; and (as I have shewn) there was at first no need of any other Officers, whilst the Apostles kept the Government of the Church in their own Hands. Now St. *Clement* reasons, if these were constituted by the Apostles, whom God intrusted with the management of his Church, and thence by God himself as God testified of *Aaron*, by the Flowers and Fruits, which he caused his Rod to bring forth; how dare any murmur against these, lest they in-

cur the displeasure of God, and suffer for their Rebellion, as they did who murmured against *Aaron*! This is *St. Clement's* arguing. When therefore his Intention was to magnify the Office of Presbyters by shewing their divine Original, as being constituted by the Apostles by the Command of God, there was no need of his mentioning any other, than those two Offices which were at first instituted by the Apostles; especially if as yet there was no other in the Church of *Corinth*.

Supposing that only Presbyters were meant by ἐπισκόπους in this Place, this is sufficient to answer to *Blondel's* other Inferences of the unreasonableness of the Decree against placing Bishops in *Villages* supposing χωραι is to be translated Villages: For tho' it was not convenient to place *Bishops* in Villages, yet in these there was need of *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* as their Assistants, to instruct them, to administer the Holy Sacraments, &c. But indeed χωραι has a larger signification, it often denoting Countries, Regions, containing in it not only many Villages but also Cities; as might easily be shewn, if there was any need, and so need not be confined to the sense that *Blondel* puts upon it. Which withal discovers the weakness of his arguing from hence against the Subjection of the *Chorepiscopi* to the Bishops of Cities, from the Ambiguity of the Word χωραι, the Institution of whom was of a later date, there being no mention of these before the Council of *Ancyra*, which was in the fourth Century, as *Blondel* himself acknowledges. Had *St. Clement* understood Villages by χωραις, in all probability he would have named Cities before them. But of *Chorepiscopi* see more *Chap 12*.

Before I proceed to shew how Bishops were after the Apostles Death settled in particular Churches, I might shew that they were the Successors of the Apostles in the Government of the Church; which is denied by some, tho' the continuance of the Office of

of Apostle is asserted and proved by Mr. Baxter. ^m
 And indeed it is evident they were thus esteemed by
 the Antient Fathers, even by those that were near
 to the time of the Apostles, as will appear after-
 wards. That the Name of *Apostle* was given to
 Bishops at that, and in after times, *Blondel* himself
 has given us many Instances. *Apolog.* p. 85. The
 want of extraordinary Gifts in Bishops which the
 Apostles had, is no ground to deny them to be Succes-
 sors of the Apostles in the government of the Church;
 no more than the want of these in Presbyters and
 Deacons will incapacitate them for their Ministries,
 and make these Offices to cease; because many of
 the first Presbyters, and even Deacons enjoyed them;
 for these last were *full of the Holy Ghost.* *Acts* 6. 5.
 Neither can the *unfixedness* of the Apostles be an
 Argument, that Bishops, who are settled in a par-
 ticular district, succeed not the Apostles; if we con-
 sider how different the Circumstances of the first and
 following Ages of the Church were. In the first,
 Strangers were to be proselyted to Christ, who were
 to become Members of the Church: The Churches,
 when gathered, to be settled and modelled, and in
 the Infancy thereof managed and governed by their
 Founders. There being many of these Churches,
 and in many distinct Nations, this prevented the
 Apostles fixing in any one District, when they had
 so many to Govern. The unfixedness therefore of
 the Apostles Office was not essential to it, but only
 Accidental, and is no reason why Bishops, who are
 confined to a particular District, cannot be their
 Successors in governing Churches already modelled.
 Besides. *St. James* himself, an Apostle, was the fixed
 Bishop of *Jerusalem*, to be a pattern in this, as in
 other respects, to other Churches in after times.

* Disputations about Church-government.

C H A P. VI.

Of Bishops fixed in particular Churches at the end of the Apostles Days. Such the Angels. Rev. 1. 20.

I Come now to single Governors of Churches, fixed in particular Churches, and this during the times of the Writers of the Holy Scriptures, the account of whom we receive from thence: And these are the *Angels* of the Seven Churches, *Rev. 1. 20.* Who, tho' not styled by the name of *Bishops*, yet were really such; in that particular Churches were committed to their care, in which they exercised Episcopal Authority, wherewith 'tis evident they were invested, when Christ *commends* them who had been faithful, and *blames* them who had been negligent in their Office of Governing the Churches committed to them; which negligence would have been no Crime, nor have deserved the Punishments by Christ denounced against them, had there been no Duty incumbent on them to discharge, by Virtue of an Office that required the Execution of such Acts of Government. There's no ground to suppose the Churches themselves are meant by *Angels*, when they are expressly made distinct from them, as *Rev. 1. 20.* The *Seven Churches* were represented by *Seven Candlesticks*, and the *Angels* by *Seven Stars*: Both themselves and their Emblems are distinguished. These described as *Stars*, whose Office it was to give Light, and other comfortable Influences to such as were subject to them; and the Churches as *Candlesticks*, or *Sockits* for Lamps, on which those Stars or Lamps were placed, and from whence they communicate their Light and Influences. Besides, 'tis evident, they

they are all along in these Epistles addressed to, as single Persons in the singular number: For tho' *Rev.* 2. 24. after Christ had particularly addressed himself to the Angel of *Thyatira*, it is said ὑμῖν ὃ λέγω, καὶ λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατείρῃς, unto you I say, and to the rest in *Thyatira*, where you in the Plural number seems to be the same with the *Angel* before spoken to, especially when distinguished from the rest in *Thyatira*; yet this difficulty is easily answered, if we consider that in antient Manuscripts, and particularly the *Alexandrian*, and in some Antient Translations, καὶ and, before λοιποῖς is omitted, and then it runs, But unto you besides, or to the rest of you in *Thyatira* I say; where all those here spoken to, are addressed to as distinct from the Angel or Bishop. ^a This rub being removed, 'tis evident that these *Angels* were single Persons; and as evident that they were intrusted with the Government of the Churches, of which they are called Angels, by the Messages that Christ sends to them. For he supposes that they had Power to try false Apostles, who said they were Apostles, and were not such, and had Authority to Con- vict and Censure them. On this reason the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* is commended by Christ, *Rev.* 2. 2. Because he could not βασάσαι bear with, or approve of them who were evil; but instead of basely complying with them, had called them to account, who pretended to be Apostles, Messengers and Ministers of Christ; whom he examined, and found not to be such, but ψευδεῖς, Lyars or Counterfeits. This manifests that this Angel executed Discipline in his Church, and that he had Authority to do it; that he examined and convicted Pretenders to the sacred Office of the Ministry, and herein discharged his Duty; in that Christ commends him for doing it, and that he fainted not, was

^a See this more largely handled by Dr. Potter of *Ch. Gov.* ch. 4. p. 145, &c.

76 *An History of the Government*

not discouraged, notwithstanding the *labour* he met with therein, discharging it for Christ's *names sake*, v. 3. So also he is commended because he hated the works of the *Nicolaitans*. Why should this Angel receive this *Encomium* from Christ in executing these Acts of Government, had it not been his Office to Govern; and whence comes it that neither the Laity nor Presbyters are sharers with him in the commendation? Which certainly they would have been, if they had been equally (or indeed at all) concerned in this Office. Which evidently proves that this Angel was the supreme Governor or *Bishop* of the Church of *Ephesus*.

That these *Angels* were *Bishops* will farther appear, by observing how the Angel of the Church of *Pergamos* is blamed, because he neglected to execute Discipline upon Offenders, in that he permitted such to continue in Communion with the Church, who were Idolaters and Heretics; *Rev. 2. 14. Because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to Idols, and to commit Fornication.* Christ reproves him that he retained these in the Church, *ὅτι ἔχεις ἐν αὐτῇ*, and did not excommunicate them, who taught others idolatrous and unclean Practices, which the *Israelites* had formerly been enticed to by *Balaam's* Counsel, and for which Sins they had felt God's severe Vengeance; which they of *Pergamos* might justly fear, if, thro' the Bishops connivance and neglect to censure such Offenders (probably the *Gnostics*) were continued among them. We find also v. 15. this Angel accused by Christ for permitting *them that held the doctrine of the Nicolaitans*; as afterwards v. 20. the Angel of the Church of *Thyatira* is, because he suffered that Woman *Jezebel*, who called herself a Prophetess, to teach and seduce his Servants to commit Fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to Idols. Now why should these Angels be so severely chidden and

and threatned by Christ for suffering these Persons to be in Church-communion, if they had no Power to eject them, and had not a particular Obligation, by virtue of their Office as Bishops, to do it? And why are *they only* reprimanded, if the Presbyters or the Laity, had Authority enabling them to do it? All which laid together is sufficient to prove, that these Angels were Persons to whom God had given Commission to govern the Churches, of which they are called the Angels, and this without any others being jointly concerned therein with them, and hence were truly Bishops.

I shall farther take notice, as a Confirmation of this, that these *Angels* must be concluded to be Persons of great Eminence in themselves, and Authority in the Church, and not of an inferior Rank; in that our Saviour directs his Epistles to them, which were designed for the use of the Churches; of which they are supposed to be Heads, * as also from the names of Honour he confers on them. They are called *Stars*, and hereby resembled the Apostles, who gave Light unto the World, and this in an high Station, in the Churches wherein they were placed, which are thence called Candlesticks: Nay farther, they even resembled Christ himself, who is called the Morning Star, ἀνατολή ἐξ ὑψους, who came to give Light to them that sate in Darkness: Which shews how much Christ himself honoured them, when he communicated to them his own Title: As he did that of *Angels*, which imports both their Dignity and Office, their resembling those glorious Beings that are immediate Attendants about God's Throne, the highest Officers in God's Kingdom, whence (even Christ himself is styled the *Angel of the Covenant*, Mal. 3. 1.) and ἀγγελικὰ πνεύματα, *Ministring Spirits*, sent forth εἰς ὁμιλίαν

* When it was the Custom to direct Epistles which were written for the use of any Church to the Bishop of that Church.

78 *An History of the Government*

for the Ministry, for the sake of them who shall inherit Salvation.

Or, if we translate the Word *Messengers*, it imports their being the *Embassadors* of the King of Kings, the *Legates* of the chief Bishop of Souls. If we take the Word in any of these Senses, it denotes great Honour and Dignity, and shews that these Persons were in a high Station in the Church. To induce us to believe that these Angels were Bishops, the learned Dr. Potter ^p has shewn from antient Records, that there was at that time or immediately after these Epistles were written by St. John, Bishops of those Churches; that *Ignatius*, about Twelve Years after, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, takes notice of their Bishop *Onesimus*: In his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, of their Bishop, whom tho' he doth not name, yet he highly Commends for his great Virtues: That *Melito* was Bishop of *Sardis*, ^q as appears by his Tracts, and *Sagaris* of *Laodicea*, mentioned by *Melito* in one of his Tracts about *Easter*, and by *Polycrates* in his Epistle to *Victor*. And above all, 'tis evident that *Polycarp*, one that had been conversant with the Apostles, was Bishop of *Smyrna*, as appears by ^r *Polycrates* his Epistle to *Victor*; by that Epistle of the Church of *Smyrna* concerning *Polycarp's* Martyrdom; by that Epistle that *Ignatius* wrote to him, and in that to the *Smyrneans*, where he enjoins Presbyters and Deacons, as well as Laymen to obey him; and from *Ireneus*, who had seen him, and declares that he was ordained Bishop of *Smyrna* by the Apostles. From all which we have sufficient Evidence that those Churches were governed by Bishops, at least immediately after that time those Epistles were sent to those Churches, and thence reason to conclude were so then, even by them whom Christ styles *Angels* of those Churches.

We have by this View seen, that as our *Saviour*

^p Of Church-government. p. 151.
l. 5. c. 26.

^r Ibid. c. 24.

^q Eusebius H. E.

laid the Foundation of his Church in an imparity of Church Officers, so the Church continued to be governed : First by the *Apostles* themselves, who had a jurisdiction over all Churches, and executed it accordingly ; partly by themselves, partly by others, to whom they communicated that Power, which they had received from Christ. Such were *Timothy* and *Titus*, who were invested with Episcopal Authority, being impowered to Ordain Presbyters and Deacons, and to Govern these as well as private Christians. And if it be supposed that these were not fixed Bishops, the one at *Crete*, the other at *Ephesus*, where they discharged the Office of *Bishops*; yet this cannot be pretended against the *Bishops* of *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, &c. who are called the *Angels* of those Churches. *Rev.* 1. 20. and 2. 1, 8. So that here is Evidence enough from the *holy Scriptures* for the Government of the Church by Bishops. Tho' in this case there is no necessity that we should recur to the holy Scriptures to prove that Bishops were settled in the Church by the Apostles, when we find them universally established in all Cities, in the first Times, and a continuance of them throughout all Ages, (till a change was made at *Geneva*,) and without any Opposition, but that of *Aerius* for which he was condemned as an Heretic; which is a sufficient proof that Bishops were established in the Church by the Apostles themselves. For otherwise, how could all Churches so soon have agreed in this Government? And how came it to pass that all the inferior Clergy and Laity should quietly every where submit to it? If *Presbyters* had originally an equal Authority with their President, how came they every where to permit the Bishop to usurp Dominion over them, when all Persons are tenacious of their Liberties, and loath to part with their Original Rights. 'Tis unaccountable, that there should in all Churches so great a change be made of what the Apostles instituted : And, that if all the Ministers of Christ had

80 *An History of the Government*

had from him an equal Power to Govern the Church, to Ordain, &c. that *Every where* they should willingly part with it; or if they were forced or imposed upon, which was then impossible, we should find no Intimation any were of their complaints against the Bishops Intrusion and Usurpation.

Besides what we find recorded in the holy Scriptures, we have a farther Account given us of the practice of the Apostles in setting Bishops in Churches, from Writers who lived near the Apostles time, who, as they were of undoubted Probity, and hence would not willingly impose on Mankind; so being so near that time, had sufficient means to be acquainted with matters of Fact of such a publick Nature; and besides were concerned to deliver nothing but what was true, in that their Adversaries against whom they produced them, had opportunities to detect their Prevarications, and would have done it, to invalidate the Arguments that depended thereon: And therefore we have all the reason imaginable to depend on theirs, as much as on any humane Testimony. We find particularly that St. John after Domitian's Death, being returned from the Isle of Patmos to Ephesus, upon an Invitation of neighbouring Churches, *'went to them, where he constituted Bishops, (viz. in Churches, which hitherto had enjoyed only the Ministry of Presbyters and Deacons;) where he framed or modelled whole Churches; and chose such into the Clergy, whom the Holy Ghost signified, (or declared fit for that sacred Office.)* But besides this, we have something more particularly related by Irenaus, who lived not long after St. John's Death,

^c Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23. ἀπὴν παρακαλέσθαι — ὅτε μὲν ἐπισκόπους καλεσθῶν ὅτε δὲ ὅλας Ἐκκλησίας ἀρμόζων· ὅτε δὲ κλήρω ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τὸ ὑπὸ τῷ πνεύματι σημαινόμενον.

^c Iren. l. 3. c. 3. The original preserved by Euseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 14. ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων καλεσθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος.

that

Tha
Bish
clar
and
Tel
ly F
late
the
posi
by f
on
by t
was
stol
vere
that
time
whe
rece
Succ
whe
Apo
non
a fu
as D
latte
or to
rity
not
Do
' St.
shop

' I
Θεμε
σίαν,
Παῦλ
αὐτ'
ἐπισκ
εὐλας

That Polycarp was constituted by the Apostles in Asia, Bishop of the Church at Smyrna, as he had before declared that Polycarp had been taught by the Apostles, and conversed with them that had seen Christ. This Testimony is the more remarkable, because this holy Father Irenæus had seen Polycarp, of whom he relates this; and then he doth this in his Appeal for the Authentickness of the Catholick Doctrine, in opposition to *Valentinus*, *Marcion*, and other Hereticks, by shewing that it was delivered down by a Succession of Bishops, the first of whom were constituted by the Apostles themselves, as particularly Polycarp was at Smyrna. He argues, that that must be Apostolick Doctrine which the Apostles themselves delivered to them whom they constituted Bishops, and that this must be the same Doctrine which was in his time taught in the Church by the Bishop thereof, when it was transmitted from the first Bishop, who receiv'd it from the Apostles in an uninterrupted Succession; as he instances particularly in Polycarp, where he supposes the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, as a thing of undoubted certainty, which none of his Adversaries could deny. Which as it is a full proof of the Succession of the Persons as well as Doctrines, the former being brought to prove the latter; so it withal shews these Persons to be superior to Presbyters, and invested with the chief Authority in the Church; because otherwise they could not have been responsible for the Tradition of such Doctrines, which were delivered by the Apostles. St. Irenæus, on the same reason, appeals to the Bishops of the Church of Rome, beginning with Linus;

* Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Eusebius gives us his own words. H. E. l. 5. c. 6. Θεμελιώσαντες ἡ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι ἡ ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνω ἡ τῷ ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχέρισαν. Τέτα τῷ Λίνω Παύλῳ ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθιον ἐπιστολαῖς μέμνη. Διαδέχεσθαι αὐτῷ Ἀνέγκλητῳ μὲν πρῶτον ἡ τρίτῳ τόπῳ ἀπὸ τῶ ἀποστόλου. ἡ ἐπισκοπῶ κληρῶ Κλήμης. Ὁ ἡ ἐωρακὼς τῶ μακαρίου ἀποστόλου. ἡ συμβεβληκὼς αὐτοῖς.

G

who

82 *An History of the Government*

who (as he observes) is mentioned by *St. Paul*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 21. *Anencletus* and *Clemens*, all of whom were acquainted with the Apostles, and by them made Bishop of that Church, from whom in a continued Succession the Apostolick Doctrine was transmitted down to *Eleutherus*, who was then Bishop of that Church. After they had founded and builded the Church, the blessed Apostles committed the Episcopal Ministry thereof to *Linus*—*Anencletus* succeeded him; the third, who after him from the Apostles was chosen into the Episcopal Office, was *Clemens*, who had seen the Apostles, and been conversant with them. And then having taken notice how he wrote an excellent Epistle to the *Corinthians*, he gives us a Catalogue of them who succeeded, viz. *Euarestus*, *Alexander*, *Xystus*, *Telephorus*, who suffered Martyrdom, *Hyginus*, *Pius*, *Anicetus*, *Soter*, and in the twelfth Succession from the Apostles, *Eleutherus*, who at that time was Bishop of *Rome*. Here I shall pass over the nine last, without any farther notice for the present, and also the two first *Linus* and *Anencletus*, whose time must be very short; but the next *St. Clemens* deserves our particular Consideration, not only on account of his valuable Epistle, (of which before,) but also by reason of the Message, which by *Hermas* (who is mentioned *Rom.* 16. 14. and whose Pastor is vindicated by the learned Bishop *Pearson* *) was sent to him; which Message is as follows, * “Thou shalt write two Books “or Scrolls, and give one of them to *Clemens*, the “other to *Grapte*: And *Grapte* (who was probably the chief of the Widows then in the Church of *Rome*) “shall admonish the Widows and Orphans; but “*Clemens* shall send to foreign [or other] Cities; but

* *Pearson's Vindic. Epist. Ignat. part. i. c. 4. p. 39, 40, 41.*

* *Herm. Past. Vis. 2. Preserved in its Original by Origen Philocal. c. 1. Γράψεις δύο βιβλία, καὶ δώσεις ἐν Κλήμεντι, καὶ ἐν Γράπτη. Καὶ Γράπτη μὲν νουθεήσει τὰς χήρας καὶ ὀρφανούς. Κλήμης δὲ πέμψῃ εἰς τὰς ἑξω πόλεις. Σὺ δὲ ἀναγχεύεις τοῖς Πρεσβυτέροις τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*

“ thou

“ thou shalt tell [or deliver the Message] to the Presbyters of the Church.” Here we find *Clemens* mentioned as distinct from the *Presbyters*, and employed in an Office, which in an especial manner belonged to the Bishop, viz. to communicate to other Churches matters of importance, wherein the Peace and Welfare of the Church was concerned, and this by writing to the Bishops of those Churches, those of his own rank; as *Hermas* was entrusted to deliver the Message to the Presbyters, which concerned them; he being in all probability himself a *Presbyter*.

Here I must not pass over another Passage of that Apostolick Writer, which in my opinion intimates the Distinction and Subordination of Christ's Ministers in the time when he wrote. *Vis. 3. §. 5.* where the Church, represented as a Woman, declares the meaning of the Vision that had been represented to him. * *Those square and white Stones* (says he) *which so exactly agree in their Closures [or Joints] are the Apostles, and Bishops, and Doctors [or Teachers] and Ministers, who have entred in by the goodness of God, and have born the Episcopal Office, and have taught and ministred holily and modestly to God's elect.* Where, as in the first place he names the *Apostles*, who were the Foundation Stones, *Eph. 2. 20.* on which the Church was built; so after the Officers that continued in the Church, first *Bishops*, who succeeded the Apostles in governing the Church; then *Presbyters*, whom he calls *Doctors*, from one of their chief Employments of Teaching; and lastly *Deacons*, under the name of *Ministri*, which is the natural rendring of *Διάκονοι*, which most probably was in the original Greek which we want. And then if the first Expression, *ingressi sunt in clementia Dei*, does refer to the Apo-

* *Hermas Vis. 3. c. 5. Lapidēs illi quadrati & albi, convenientes in commissuris suis, ii sunt Apostoli, & Episcopi, & Doctores, & Ministri qui ingressi sunt in clementiā Dei, & Episcopatum gesserunt, & docuerunt, & ministraverunt sanctē & modestē electis Dei, &c.*

84 *An History of the Government*

stles, as entered into their heavenly Rest, the following denote the several Services of the Rest; that of *Episcopatum gesserunt*, of the Bishops; *docuerunt*, of the Presbyters; and *ministraverunt*, of the Deacons. But this I humbly offer to the Judgment of judicious Readers.

But whatever the meaning may be of this last cited Passage, we have from ancient undoubted Monuments found, that Bishops were placed by the Apostles themselves at *Smyrna*, and at *Rome*, with a Succession of them; which is as much as can well be expected in this case, considering how few Writers we have of that time, and that they were such who did not designedly write Histories, but only accidentally mention these things. The like might be shewn of Bishops placed at *Ephesus*; for, besides the Angel of that Church, *Rev. 2. Polycrates* in his Epistle to *Victor*, mentions a Succession of Bishops there of his own Kindred, of whom he was the eighth, which brings it up to the time of the Apostles, of which more *Ch. 8*. And the fourth general Council, that of *Chalcedon*, mentions twenty seven Bishops of that City from *St. Timothy*, who had been ordained at *Ephesus*. But we need not confine our selves to those few Churches, when the forecited Passage out of *Clement's Hypotyposes*,^y tells us, that *St. John* went from *Ephesus* to ordain Bishops in the neighbouring Churches, (that were *Ecclesia alumna Johannis*, in *Tertullian* against *Marcion*, *St. John's Foster Churches*) which Expression denotes a considerable number of Churches, and proportionably of Bishops. Besides, *St. Jerom*,^z to whom our Adversaries appeal, tells us that this was an ancient Tradition that *St. John* wrote his Gospel at the request of the Bishops of *Asia*, which supposes Bishops settled there during that Apostle's Life. And^a mentions *Polycarp* as ordained Bishop of *Smyrna* by *St. John*. I might have shewn here how

^y *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23.*

^z *Hieronym. in Catalogo.*

^a *Ibid.*

Bishops were placed very early in other Churches, and particularly in *Antioch*; but that will be the Subject of the next Chapter. Only here I must name one, viz. *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis*; who tho' he had seen none of the Apostles, yet he had conversed with many who had seen them, and hence was near their time, *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 36, 39.*

But before I come to take notice of the Succession of Bishops in other Churches, I must observe it in that of *Jerusalem*, the Mother of all other Christian Churches, in which (as I have observed) a Bishop was very early settled by the Apostles themselves, with Presbyters and Deacons, as a Pattern for other Churches. That first Bishop was *St. James* the Son of *Alpheus*, who wrote the catholick Epistle, which is the first of them in the Canon of the New Testament. This glorious Martyr suffering by the tumultuous *Jews* (who threw him down from the Temple, after that illustrious Testimony he gave of Christ) is delivered to us not only by Christian Writers, but also by *Josephus* the Jewish Historian. After his Martyrdom, and the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, which immediately followed it, ^b *Eusebius* tells us from ancient Tradition, " That the Apostles, and other Disciples of our Lord, who were as yet alive, from several places assembled together with the Kindred of our Lord, many of whom were then living, that they might in common consult who was most worthy to succeed *James*: And that all unanimously agreed upon *Symeon* the Son of *Cleophas*, who is mentioned in the Gospel, as most worthy of that Episcopal Throne, who was a near Kinsman of our Saviour's. *Eusebius* afterwards tells us ^c that he continued Bishop of *Jerusalem* till *Trajan's* time, and that then (a Persecution being raised against the Christians) he, and others of our Saviour's Kindred, suffered Martyrdom; and that he for several days suffered exquisite

^b *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 11.*

^c *Ibid. c. 32.*

Torments with singular Courage, tho' an hundred and twenty Years old : And that ^d *Justus* succeeded him as Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who was a *Jew*, Myriads of which Nation were converted to the Christian Faith. The same Historian tells us, ^e that to the time that *Jerusalem* was destroyed by the Emperor *Adrian*, there were fifteen short liv'd Bishops of that City, whose Names he there gives us ; the shortness of whose Government we have no reason to wonder at, when we consider the barbarous Inhumanity of the *Jews* at that time, and their monstrous Malignity against Christians, which no doubt chiefly vented it self against the Bishops, who were the most strenuous Asserters of the Christian Faith, many of whom fell as Victims to their insatiable Malice.

Besides, when these Bishops were of *Jewish* Extraction, and probably circumcised ; 'tis not to be wonder'd at, that the *Romans*, in a time when they were forced upon great Severities against the *Jews*, by reason of their frequent Rebellions, should slay Persons of that Nation without Distinction ; and that some of these Bishops, of whom the *Romans* made no difference from other *Jews*, should fall by their Swords in these promiscuous Slaughters.

This may suffice to shew the Unreasonableness of *D. Blondel's* Declamation in his Historical Preface, p. 17.

These hitherto were all originally *Jews*, as were generally the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem* : But ^f when for their Rebellions they were subdued by the Emperor *Adrian*, the City was emptied of its old Inhabitants, the *Jews* forbidden to enter it, the name altered to that of *Elia*, and replenished with a *Roman* Colony, and from henceforth as the Inhabitants, so the Bishops thereof were of *Gentile* Extraction ; of whom therefore no more for the present.

^d *Enseb. H. E. c. 35.*

^e *Ibid. l. 4. c. 5.*

^f *Ibid. c. 6.*

CHAP. VII.

Of the Church of Antioch, its first Bishops, particularly Ignatius, and his asserting the Authority of Bishops.

AS for that eminent Church of God at *Antioch* in *Syria*, we have in the *Acts of the Apostles*, an account ^a of its first Converts ^b of the farther Progress of the Gospel there under *St. Barnabas* and *St. Paul*, ^c of their sending Relief to the Christians in *Judea*, which shews the considerableness of the Church, as well as the greatness of their Zeal and Charity; as also ^d the Prophets and Teachers among them, to whom by Revelation the holy Ghost gave a Command to send forth *Paul* and *Barnabas* to preach to the *Gentiles*, and ^e their declaring to that Church the Success of their Ministry; ^f the Controversy that arose among them about the Observation of *Mosaic Rites*, and the Decree of the Apostles concerning it; ^g the sending of that Decree to that Church by *chosen men*, of whom it pleased *Silas* to abide there. And withal, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* continued in *Antioch*, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also. And we have reason to conclude this Church to be under the Care, Inspection and Government of those Apostles; and also under that of *St. Peter*, whom we find at *Antioch*, *Gal. 2. 11.* probably visiting them; besides that of all the Apostolick College, whose concern for them we have seen from *Acts 15.* After which time, when neither the History of the *Acts*, nor any other part of the New

^a *Acts* 11. 19, 20, 21.

^b *v.* 22, 26.

^c *v.* 29, 30.

^d *Acts* 13. 12.

^e *Acts* 14. 27

^f *Acts* 15. 1, 2.

^g *v.* 22, 34, 35.

88 *An History of the Government*

Testament gives us any farther Account of that Church, we cannot reasonably expect to find at that time any Bishop set over them; nor indeed was there any need thereof then, when they were under the immediate Government of the Apostles. But after that time *Eusebius* (who being Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*, an inquisitive Person, and a great Searcher into the Antiquities of the Church, cannot be supposed to be ignorant of the Records of the neighbouring Churches of *Syria*, and this famous one of *Antioch*) tells us ^b that *Euodius* was the first Bishop of *Antioch*, and that *Ignatius* succeeded him. Which being related by *Eusebius*, and generally received, there's no need of reconciling the seeming Inconsistencies of some later Writers, cited by *Blondell*, in his *Preface*. p. 20 21. That *Ignatius* was Bishop of that great City, and that very early (as well as his eminent Piety, Zeal for God and Religion, signal Courage in his patient and chearful enduring Indignities, and an ignominious Death for Christ's sake) appears from those excellent *Epistles* which he wrote in his Passage from *Antioch* to *Rome*, where he, by the Sentence of the Emperor *Trajan*, suffered Death: For, he being desirous of the Prosperity of Christian Churches, as he admonishes those thro' which he passed, so he wrote to other Churches by their Bishops or Presbyters, who came to testify their own Respects to him, and of the Churches which they represented, in his Journey towards his Martyrdom. In these *Epistles* he excites them to obey and please God; cautions them against Heresies which were then crept into the Church; and in order to preserve their Integrity and Soundness of Faith, as well as on other Reasons, persuades them to keep united to, and in Communion with their Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons. He expresses a more than ordinary concern for the Church of *Antioch*, of

^b *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 22.*

which

which he was Bishop, for whose Welfare he was very solicitous, and hence recommends it, as well as himself to be remembred by them in their Prayers; and desires them to send some Persons as Legats to testify their Love and Respect to that Church, and implores *Polycarp* the Bishop of *Smyrna*, to shew his particular regard to it; besides other Matters of importance, which manifest his earnest Desire to promote the Honour of God, and the Prosperity of his Church. ⁱ

These Epistles of that holy Martyr, which were published by Archbishop *Usher* in an ancient Latin Version, and since by Dr. *Isaac Vossius* in the original Greek, from a Manuscript in the *Florentine Library*, are undoubtedly *Ignatius's* genuine Epistles; as is evident from the Testimony of the first and ensuing Ages; they are mentioned by St. *Polycarp* a Disciple of St. *John*, who both before and after St. *Ignatius's* Martyrdom, was Bishop of *Smyrna*, who is mentioned in the Epistle to that Church, and is one to whom one of these Epistles is written. He speaks of them in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, as those which he sent to them together with his own; as appears by that part of the Epistle which ^k *Eusebius* has preserv'd in its Original. St. *Irenaeus* also in the next Age, who was Bishop of *Lyons*, and had been a Disciple of *Polycarp*, mention'd *Ignatius* and his Epistles, as ^l *Eusebius* testifies. As also did *Origen* in the next Century; and so did ^m *Eusebius* afterwards, who gives us a full account of these Epistles, and where the holy Martyr wrote them. These with other Testimonies, as of *Athanasius*, *Jerome*, and many others are recited by the learned Bishop *Pearson* in his *Vindicia Epist. S. Ignatii*, where he fully refutes all the Exceptions which Mr. *Daille* and others have made against these Epistles. To which nothing

ⁱ These the Reader may peruse translated into English by Bp Wake.

^k *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 36.* ^l *Id. l. 5. c. 1.* ^m *Id. l. 3. c. 38.*

of any weight hath appeared to disprove what that excellent Prelate hath so strenuously and clearly written in their Vindication.

Out of these Epistles I shall now produce several Passages that evince, that Bishops were at that time universally placed in the Church; and these distinct from, and superior to Presbyters as well as Deacons; how Bishops were judged by him of divine Institution, and necessary to the Being of a Church; which declare also, that to be subject to the Bishops, and in union with them, is the Duty of the Laity, and also of Presbyters and Deacons; that no religious Act could be regularly and validly performed without the Bishop, or at least such Officers who received their Authority from him, and the Nullity of what was acted otherwise; that there was no Communion to be maintained with Christ himself, but by maintaining Communion with the Bishop, and how great their sin is who separate from him; and withal, that what he asserted, *That nothing ought to be done without the Bishop*, he receiv'd by immediate Revelation from Christ himself, (a Privilege in those days sometimes vouchsafed by God to his eminent Servants) for the Truth of which he appeals to Christ himself.

In his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, having taken notice of their Respect to him as a Sufferer for Christ, expressed by their Bishop *Onesimus*, and congratulated their Happiness in being under the Care of such a Bishop, and also shewn what Refreshment he enjoyed from their Deacon *Burrhus* (whose continuance with him he desired) and from the Presbyters of their Church, who in their stead visited and attended him; where he expressly distinguishes the Offices of Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons: He tells them how it became them to glorify *Jesus Christ*, “ who had
“ conferred Glory on them; and that by one [or
“ an uniform] Obedience, they should be perfectly
“ joined together in the same mind, and in the same
“ Judgment; and that they should all speak the same
“ thing;

“ t
“ a
“ t
“ F
“ C
“ v
“ d
“ F
“ t
“ o
“ d
“ A
“ V
“ o
“ y
“ n
“ F
“ a
“ [
“ a
“ C
“ F
“ n
“ [
“ C
“ k
“ M
“ t

Kαὶ
γὰρ
Χεῖρ
κόπῃ
ἡεῖο
καθὰ
σῶσιν
οὐκ ἔστι
μὴ
καὶ
ἡμᾶ

“ thing; and that being in subjection to the Bishop
 “ and College of Presbyters, they might be in all
 “ things [or wholly and thoroughly] sanctified.

He adds afterwards. “ I beseech you, ὅπως σω-
 “ ῥεῖσθε τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ, that you would concur
 “ with the mind of God. For *Jesus Christ* our [in-
 “ divisible] indisputable Life is the mind of the
 “ Father; so also the Bishops, who are constituted
 “ to the utmost ends of the Earth, are, [or are in,
 “ or according to] the mind of *Jesus Christ*,] i. e. or-
 “ dained according to the will of Christ known to the
 “ Apostles, and by them deliver’d to the Church.]
 “ Whence it becomes you to concur with the mind
 “ of [your] Bishop; which likewise you do. For
 “ your College of Presbyters, which deserves to be
 “ named, [and is] worthy of God, is in as perfect
 “ Harmony with the Bishop, as [well tuned] Strings
 “ are in [or with] the Harp. *Jesus Christ* is sung
 “ [his Praises chanted forth] by your Unanimity
 “ and harmonious Love: And each of you are a
 “ Chorus, so that agreeing together [as in a Sym-
 “ phony] in [true] Concord, and taking up the
 “ melodious Song of God, ye may in perfect Unity
 “ [as] with one Voice, sing to the Father thro’ *Jesus*
 “ *Christ*; that hence he may both hear you, and ac-
 “ knowledge you by what you do, to be indeed the
 “ Members of his Son. It will therefore be advan-
 “ tageous to you to live in this unspotted [unblame-

“ Ad Ephes. c. 3. 4. — ὅπως σωτρεύητε τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
 Καὶ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸ ἀδιάκλειτον ἡμῶν ζῆν, τὸ πατρὸς ἡ
 γνώμη, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα δεσπούντες ἐν Ἰησοῦ
 Χριστῷ γνώμη εἰσιν. Ὅθεν πρέπει ὑμῖν σὺν ἡρέσει τῇ τῷ ἐπισ-
 κόπῳ γνώμῃ, ὅπως καὶ ποιεῖτε. Τὸ ὅτι ἀξιογράματον ὑμῶν πρεσβυ-
 τέριον, τὸ θεῷ ἀξίον, ὥστε σωθήσεσθαι τὰ ἐπισκόπων, ὡς χορδαὶ
 καθάραι. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν, καὶ συμφώνῳ ἀγάπῃ Ἰη-
 σοῦς Χριστὸς ἁδελφί. καὶ οἱ καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς ὡς χορδαὶ γίνεσθε, ἵνα συμφω-
 νοὶ ᾖτε ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καρδίᾳ θεῷ λαβόντες ἐν ἐνότητι ἁδελφί ἐν φωνῇ
 μιᾷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ πάσι, ἵνα ὑμεῖς καὶ ἀκρόση, καὶ ἐπιγινώσ-
 κων δι’ ὧν ἐπεφωτίε, μέλη ὄντας τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτῶν. Χρήσιμον ἔν δὲ
 ὑμᾶς ἐν ἀμώμῳ ἐνότητι εἶναι, ἵνα καὶ θεῷ πάντοτε μετέχητε.

“able Unity, that so ye may always partake of
 “[or communicate with] God himself.” In which
 words he supposes that they could not be in com-
 munion with God unless they were in union with
 the Bishop, which afterwards he more fully expres-
 presses. He goes on. “For if I in this little time
 “have had such a Familiarity with your Bishop,
 “which was not humane [or carnal] but spiritual;
 “how much more do I esteem you happy who are
 “so joined to him, as the Church is to *Jesus Christ*,
 “and *Jesus Christ* to the Father, that all things may
 “agree together in unity? Let not any one deceive
 “himself; if any one is not within the Altar, he
 “is deprived of the Bread of God. If the Prayer
 “of one or two have so great Efficacy, [as we are
 “told *Mat. 18. 19.*] how much more [prevalent]
 “will that of the Bishop and the whole Church be?
 “He therefore who comes not to the same place,
 “[that is, with the Bishop and the Church] the
 “same is proud, and hath condemned himself. For
 “it is writtten, *God resisteth the proud*. Let us there-
 “fore be exceeding careful that we do not resist [or
 “set our selves against] the Bishop, that we may
 “be the Subjects of God, — Whomsoever the
 “Master of the House sends to take care of his House,
 “we ought so to receive him, as [we would] him
 “that sent him. Wherefore it is evident that we

° Ibid. c. 5, 6. Εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐν μικρῷ χρόνῳ τοιαύτῳ συνήθειαν
 ἔχον πρὸς τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῶν ἐκ ἀνθρωπίνης ἔσαν, ἀλλὰ πνευμα-
 τικῶς, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς μακαρίζω τοὺς ἐγκεκεραμένους ὑμῶν,
 ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ, ἵνα
 πάντα ἐν ἐνότητι σύμφωνα ᾖ. Μηδεὶς πλανᾷτω, εἰ μὴ τις ἢ
 ἐν ἑλὸς θυσιασθεῖς, ὑπερεῖς τῷ ἀρετῇ καὶ θεῷ. Εἰ γὰρ ἐνός καὶ διδύμου
 προσδοχὴ τοσαύτην ἴσχω ἔχει, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἢ τε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ
 πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ; Ὁ ἔν μὴ ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, ἔττω ἢ δὴ
 ὑπερηφανεῖ, καὶ ἑαυτὸν διέκεινεν. — Σπουδάζοντες ἐν μέντοι ἀντιτάσσ-
 εσθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἵνα ὡς θεῷ ὑποτασσόμενοι. — Πάντα
 ὅν πέμπει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἰς ἰδίαν οἰκονομίαν, ὥτως δεῖ αὐτὸν
 δεξασθαι, ὡς αὐτὸν τὸ πέμψαντα. Τὸν ἐν ἐπισκόπον δῆλον, ὅτι
 ὡς αὐτὸν κύριον δεῖ προσελάττειν.

“ought

“ ought to respect the Bishop, as [we would] the Lord himself.

“ And again, *Ch. 20.* He expresses his Desire that he might hear that they agreed together in the same Faith, and that they were obedient to the Bishop, and to the College of Presbyters with a firm mind, breaking one [or the same] Bread, which is the Medicine of Immortality, an Antidote [to preserve us] that we might not die, but live for ever with *Jesus Christ.*” *Breaking one bread,* that is, receiving the Communion of Christ’s Body and Blood in the Bishop’s Church, or from Presbyters subject to him, and not in Conventicles of Hereticks or Schismatics.

In his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, from whom their Bishop, two Presbyters and a Deacon came to him at *Smyrna*, to express their value of him, and the Honour they had for him, who with so great Alacrity was going to suffer Death for Christ’s sake, he thus writes, ^p “ Seeing I am esteemed worthy to see you in [or by] *Damas* your Bishop, who [walks] ^q worthy of God, and by your worthy Presbyters *Bassus* and *Apollonius*, and by my Fellow-Servant *Sotio* your Deacon, in whom may I have Joy, in that he is [subject] obedient to the Bishop as to the Grace of God, and to the College of Presbyters as the Law of *Jesus Christ.*” Here he expressly names their Bishop *Damas*, and their Presbyters *Bassus* and *Apollonius*, and as clearly distinguishes them from their Bishop, as he doth their Deacon *Sotio*. ^q He bids them, that they should not have the less Respect to their Bishop by reason of his Age, but pay a due Reverence to him, as the Presbyters did, notwithstanding his νεωτερινη ταχης, ^r being in the Rank of young Men. ^r He bids them with godly

^p *Ad Magnes. c. 2.* ^q *Answerable to Col. 1. 10.* ^r *Ibid. c. 3, 4.*

^r See Bp. Pearson’s *Pref. to his Vindic. Ignat. where he shews the unreasonableness of Blondel, who infers the novel Institution of Episcopacy from that Phrase.*

94 *An History of the Government*

Prudence to submit to him, " But [thereby] not
 " to him, but to the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*
 " the Bishop of all Men. It will therefore behove
 " you to hearken to him without any Hypocrisie [or
 " Dissimulation] to his Honour that requires this,
 " because he who acts [otherwise] deceives not the
 " Bishop whom he sees, but strives to cheat [the
 " Bishop] that is invisible." Afterwards he esteems
 them to be Christians only in name, and not in rea-
 lity, who call him, who is over them, Bishop, but
 act without him, χωρὶς αὐτοῦ, i. e. without his
 Authority, or Power derived from him; and looks
 on these as ἐκ συσυνείδητοι, as not acting consci-
 entiously, because they assemble together (μὴ βεβαίως)
 not on any firm Foundation according to the Com-
 mandment [of God.] Afterwards having shewn that
 Life and Death are set before us, and one of these
 must be our Portion; he urges the *Magnesians* to be
 careful to do all things ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ Θεοῦ, in godly Peace
 or Unanimity with God, " The Bishop presiding
 " in the place of God, and the Presbyters in the
 " place of the Council of the Apostles, and the
 " Deacons who are dear to me, as intrusted with
 " the Ministry of *Jesus Christ*." After having
 persuaded to mutual Love, and the avoiding of
 Divisions; he bids them " To be united to their
 " Bishop, ἐνώθητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, and those that presi-
 " ded over them, as their Pattern and Direction
 " [in their way] to Immortality." Then follows,
 " " As therefore the Lord, who is united [to him]
 " doth nothing without the Father, neither by him-
 " self, nor by the Apostles; so do you nothing
 " without the Bishop and the Presbyters; nor at-
 " tempt to make any thing appear reasonable, [or
 " well done] that is done apart by your selves, [ἰδίᾳ
 " ὑμῶν, that is, without the Bishop's Concurrence]
 " But when you assemble together in the same

^c *Epist. ad Magnes. c. 6.*

^c *c. 7.*

" place;

“ place, let there be one [common] Prayer, one
 “ Supplication, one Mind, one Hope, [doing all]
 “ in Love and Joy undefiled. There is one Lord
 “ *Jesus Christ*, than whom nothing is better. Let
 “ all therefore run together as unto the Temple of
 “ God,” [as the first Christians did, *Acts* 2. 46.
 whose Unanimity he alludes to and recommends, who
 did *προσκαρτερεῖν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*] “ as to one
 “ Altar, as to one *Jesus Christ*, who came forth from
 “ the one Father, who exists in, and returns to the
 “ One [Father.] And then having armed them a-
 “ gainst the Errors of Judaizers and Ebionites, * he
 persuades them to persist in the true Christian
 Faith: And that they might do thus, and prof-
 “ per in Body and Spirit, in Faith and Charity, in
 “ the Son, and the Father, and the Holy Ghost, in
 “ the Beginning, and in the End, [Do this, saith
 “ he] with your most worthily honoured Bishop, and
 “ with the well complicated spiritual Crown of your
 “ College of Presbyters, and your Deacons who are
 “ according to God. Be subject to your Bishop,
 “ and to one another, as *Jesus Christ* to the Father ac-
 “ cording to the Flesh, and the Apostles to Christ,
 “ and to the Father, and to the [Holy] Ghost,
 “ that there may be a bodily [or outward] and a
 “ spiritual Union.

In the Inscription of *S. Ignatius's* Epistle to the
Philadelphians, he salutes them in the blood of *Jesus*
Christ, who is [our] everlasting and permanent Joy, e-
 specially, if they were at Unity with the Bishop, and the
 Presbyters that were with him, and the Deacons who
 were appointed according to the mind of *Jesus Christ*,
 whom he had according to his own will, with [all] firm-
 ness, established by the Holy Ghost. And then goes on.
 “ Which Bishop I know did obtain that Ministry,
 “ which conduces to the publick Good, not of him-
 “ self, nor by Men, nor out of vain Glory, but in

* *Epist. ad Magnes. c. 13.*

* *Epist. ad Philadelph. c. 1.*

96 *An History of the Government*

“ the Love of God the Father, and the Lord *Jesús*
 “ *Christ*. ² Afterwards, *Avoid Divisions* and false
 “ Doctrines: For where the Shepherd is, there do
 “ ye as his Sheep follow him. And after, Abstain
 “ from evil Plants, which are not of *Jesús Christ*’s
 “ Husbandry, because they are not of the Father’s
 “ planting. Not that I found any Division among
 “ you, but refining. For whosoever are of God and
 “ *Jesús Christ*, these are with the Bishop, and who-
 “ soever being penitent shall return to the Unity of
 “ the Church, these shall become God’s [people]
 “ that they may live according to *Jesús Christ*. Do
 “ not err, my Brethren, if any one follows such a
 “ one as makes a Schism [in the Church,] he shall
 “ not inherit the Kingdom of God. ³ Studiously
 “ endeavour to partake of one [or the same] Eucha-
 “ rist. For there is but one Flesh of our Lord
 “ *Jesús Christ*, and one Cup in the Union of his
 “ Blood, and one Altar, as there is one Bishop, to-
 “ gether with the College of Presbyters and the Dea-
 “ cons, my Fellow-Servants, that whatever ye do,
 “ ye may do it according to God. Afterwards,
 “ When I was among you, I cryed out, and spake
 “ with a loud Voice; [the old Latin Version adds]
 “ *with the Voice of God*] *Adhere to your Bishop, and*
 “ *to the College of Presbyters, and to the Deacons*. Some
 “ suspected that I spake this, as being before acquain-
 “ ted with the Schism that some had made: But he is
 “ my Witness for whose sake I am in Bonds, that I
 “ knew nothing of it by any humane means, but the
 “ Spirit proclaimed these things, saying; *Do nothing*
 “ *without the Bishop; Keep your Bodies as the Temple*
 “ *of God; Love Unity; Fly Divisions; be Followers*
 “ *of Jesús Christ, as he also is of the Father*. A little
 “ after, ^c Where there is Division and Wrath,
 “ there God doth not dwell. But God will forgive

² *Epist. ad Philadelph. c. 2, 3.*

³ *Ibid. c. 4.*

^b *Ibid. c. 7.*

^c *Ibid. c. 8.*

“ all that repent, if they repent [so as to return] to
 “ the Unity of God, and to the Council of the Bi-
 “ shop.” This holy Martyr express’d a peculiar
 Concern for the Church of *Antioch*; of which he
 was Bishop; and as he rejoiced at the News of their
 Peace, or the ceasing of their Persecution; so ^d he
 desires the *Philadelphians* to send a Deacon to congra-
 tulate their happy State, and propound the Exam-
 ple of other Churches, some of whom had sent
 thither their Bishops, some their Presbyters, and o-
 thers their Deacons; where these three Orders are
 (as in other places) expressly distinguished. In the
 Epistle to the *Trallians*, having ^e told them how he
 was acquainted with their Purity and Patience, by
 their Bishop *Polybius*, in whom he beheld them all:
 He adds, ^f “ That seeing they were subject to their
 “ Bishop, they appeared to him to live not after the
 “ manner of Men, but according to *Jesus Christ*.
 And a little after; “ It is necessary, as it is your
 “ Practice, that you do nothing without your Bi-
 “ shop: Be subject to the College of Presbyters as
 “ to the Apostles of *Jesus Christ* our Hope, in whose
 “ Conversation let us be found: And the Deacons,
 “ who are the Mystery of *Jesus Christ*, ought
 “ [to endeavour] by all means to please all. For
 “ they are not Deacons [or Ministers] of Meats and
 “ Drinks, but Ministers of the Church of God. For
 “ they must avoid blame-worthy Actions as they
 “ would do Fire. ^g In like manner let all reverence
 “ the Deacons as *Jesus Christ*; also the Bishop as the
 “ Son of the Father, and the Presbyters as the
 “ Council of God, and College [or joint Assembly]
 “ of the Apostles. Without these ^h *ἡ ἐκκλησία*, it
 “ cannot be called a Church.” Afterwards, when
 he cautions them against being seduced by Hereticks,
 he adds, “ ⁱ This will you do, if you are not puffed

^d Epist. ad Philadelph. c. 10.

^e Ibid. c. 2.

^f Ibid. c. 3.

^g Epist. ad Trall. c. 1.

^h Ibid. c. 7.

“ up, and are not separated from God, *Jesus Christ*,
 “ and the Bishop, and the Precepts of the Apostles.
 “ He that is within the Altar is pure; He [who is
 “ not within] that is, who acts any thing without
 “ the Bishop, and the College of Presbyters and the
 “ Deacons, is not pure in Conscience.” Afterwards,
 “ when he bids them *Farewel in Jesus Christ*, he in-
 culcates this again as his parting Request, that it
 might make the deeper Impression; *Be subject to your*
Bishop, as to the Command of God, and so likewise to
the College of Presbyters; and let each of you love one
another with an undivided Heart.

In his Epistle to the *Smyrneans* he thus writes.
 * “ Flee Divisions as the Beginning of Evils. Let
 “ all of you follow the Bishop, as *Jesus Christ* does
 “ the Father, and the College of Presbyters as the
 “ Apostles; and reverence the Deacons as the Com-
 “ mandment of God. Let none do any thing in
 “ things which concern the Church without the Bi-
 “ shop. Let that be esteemed a valid Eucharist
 “ which is [celebrated] by the Bishop, or by one
 “ whom he appoints. For where the Bishop appears,
 “ there let the People be, even as where *Jesus Christ*
 “ is, there the Catholick Church is. Without the
 “ Bishop it is not lawful, neither to baptize, nor to
 “ celebrate the Love-feasts, [and therewith the
 “ Lord’s Supper:] But whatsoever he approves,
 “ that is also well-pleasing to God, that so every
 “ thing that is done may be secure and valid. After-
 “ wards, ¹ It is well to know [or to pay a due re-
 “ gard to] God and the Bishop. He that honou-
 “ reth the Bishop, is honoured of God. He that
 “ does any thing without the Bishop’s Privity, serves
 “ the Devil.” Here by the way I observe, from
 this Expression, *λάτρεα ὑποσκόπῃ*, and that afore, that
whatever the Bishop approves, is valid; that *Ignatius*
 confines not the Christians to that single Congregati-

ⁱ Epist. ad Trall. c. 13.

* Epist. ad Smyrn. c. 7. 8.

¹ c. 9.

on where the Bishop was present, by that other Expression, *where the Bishop appears, there let the People be.* In that he shews the validity of such Ministrations, that were performed by them who had Authority from the Bishop: *Let that be esteemed a valid Eucharist, which is by the Bishop, or by one whom he appoints.* And, *whatever he approves, that is well-pleasing to God.* This supposes Presbyters to officiate in other Congregations besides that in which the Bishop was present, and these assembled by his Approbation and Commission, and thence valid. Whereas those that were without the Bishop's Allowance, were unlawful and invalid. And accordingly, the *One Altar*, as the *One Bishop* in his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, only denotes maintaining Communion with the Bishop; answerably to the *One publick Altar* for Sacrifices among the *Jews*, to which all the Males three times a Year resorted. This hindred not the Building of Synagogues in other Tribes, nor erecting such Altars as that at Mount *Ebal*, *Josh. 8. 31.* Accordingly in the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, *Run together as unto the Temple of God, as unto one Altar.* This alludes to the Temple of *Jerusalem*, to which all God's People were to resort, and to own Communion with the High-Priest, in which consisted the Unity of the Jewish Church, notwithstanding they were divided into many Synagogues and Congregations.

But to return from this Digression. Towards the end of the Epistle he thus writes, " I salute your very worthy Bishop, and most venerable College of Presbyters, and my Fellow-Servants the Deacons.

In his Epistle to *Polycarp*, whom he styles the Bishop of that Church of *Smyrna*, he thus writes; " Let nothing be done without thine Approbation, neither do thou any thing without God's Approval, as indeed you do not." Farther, when this Epistle, tho' written to the Bishop, was to be

^m Epist. ad *Smyrn.* c. 12.

ⁿ Epist. ad *Polycarp.* c. 4.

100 *An History of the Government*

read in the Assemblies under his care, he directs several things of general Concernment to the Church, (as *St. Paul* did in his Epistles which he wrote to *Timothy*;) among which are these that follow: After he had given Instructions to married Persons how they should demean themselves, and then to those who continued in a Virgin State, ° he cautions these latter against “ Boasting, and pronounces such a one “ (*ἐφθαρ*) is undone, in a State of *Φθορά*, *ἐὰν γνωδῇ* “ *ᾧ πλέον τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ*, who thought himself (on that “ reason better than the Bishop, or that he excelled “ him in (*γνώσει*) Knowledge:” Possibly such as were warping to the *Gnostick* Heresy. And then follows; “ It becomes both the Men and Women “ that marry, to come together with the Approba- “ tion of the Bishop, that their Marriage may be “ according to God, and not in Lust. Let all things “ be done to the Honour of God. Give heed to the “ Bishop, that God may [give heed] to you. Let “ my Soul be Security for them who are subject to “ the Bishop, the Presbyters and Deacons, and may “ I have my Portion in God with such.

By these Passages which I have cited out of *St. Ignatius's* Epistles, 'tis evident what Government was then universally established in the Churches of Christ, viz. that of Bishops, and these settled to the utmost parts of the Earth; and these distinct from, and superior to Presbyters; and withal, the great Authority that Bishops had in the Church, so that whatever Power other inferior Officers had in the Church, it was derived from the Bishop, and exercised in Conjunction with, and Subordination to him: Also, that Bishops were absolutely necessary, in that nothing could be done lawfully, or with any Efficacy, without the Bishop, or Persons authorized by him; that whatever was done otherwise, was of no validity; that neither Baptism nor the Lord's Supper were

° *Epist. ad Polycarp. c. 5.*

valid,

valid
who
further
ἐπισ
batio
oppe
worsh
with
muni
delud
absol
Reve
which
were
mind
and h
All
view
havin
impro
Salvat
the H
his Ca
Now
derati
his Kn
of the
when
probab
some c
undou
to que
Truth
his Ep
his Pi
which
though

valid, that were celebrated without him, or by any who did not derive their Authority from him: Nay further, ^p that whoever did any religious Act *καθ' ἑαυτὸν*, without the Bishop's Privity or Approbation, and in Communions separate from him, or opposite to him, *τὸν διαβόλῳ λατρεύει*, serves, or worships the Devil. Further, he recommends Union with the Bishop, and a firm Adherence to his Communion, as the means to secure Christians from being deluded by Hereticks; and that this Unity was the absolute Duty of Christians, for which he urges a Revelation vouchsafed to himself, for the Truth of which he appeals to God himself. And that Bishops were instituted *ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ γνώμῃ*, according to the mind of Christ revealed to the Apostles. *Ad Ephes.* and hence of divine Institution.

All this the holy Martyr wrote, when he was in view of Death, to which he was condemn'd, when having but a little time to live, he was desirous to improve his last Hours as much as might be for the Salvation of Mens Souls, the Welfare of the Church, the Honour of his Master Christ, and the Interest of his Cause; for whom he was a going to be sacrificed. Now certainly all this challenges our serious Consideration, in that we can have no reason to question his Knowledge of the State of Christ's Church, and of the Government which his Apostles settled in it; when he lived so near the Apostles times, nay in all probability was acquainted with, and instructed by some of them, intimate with holy *Polycarp*, who was undoubtedly a Disciple of *St. John*: Much less ground to question his Sincerity in delivering any thing but Truth, when his Name *Theophorus*, which he uses in his Epistles, one having Christ in his Breast, speaks his Piety, and especially if we consider that Zeal which he exprest for Christ, in rejoicing that he was thought worthy to suffer Death and Ignominy for

his sake, his expecting it with such ardent Desire, and his enduring it with so great Constancy and undaunted Courage. Hence we cannot imagin, that a Person of such singular Piety, would, especially when in immediate Prospect of Death, impose upon Christians: Nay further, if we could suppose that he should have endeavoured to have put a Cheat upon them, it was impossible that he could have brought in any other Government than what had been of late settled in the Church by the Apostles, when that must have been known to every one. But his pious Design was to mind Christians of their Duties, and particularly to *keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace*, to live in Submission and Obedience to their Bishops, to keep in Communion with them and the Presbyters that were under them; and then to urge the performance of these and other Christian Duties with the most prevalent Arguments: And all this, from a fear lest they should have been drawn away by Seducers, who began then to corrupt the Doctrine, and disturb the Peace of Christ's Church; both which he justly apprehended to be highly dishonourable to God, and tending to the Ruin of Men's Souls, and thence necessary to be withstood by him with the greatest Zeal, and that nothing could be a fitter dying Request to Christians, when taking his last Farewel of them, than to caution them against these Enormities.

I have hopes, that when Christian Readers have diligently perused and seriously considered what is thus delivered by this excellent Bishop of *Antioch*, a Disciple of the blessed Apostles, and like them abounding with Love to God, and Zeal for his Glory, who cheerfully suffered Indignities from his rude Guard, it being for his Master Christ's sake, rejoiced in the Expectation of Death in his Cause, and for his Glory, and at length suffered Martyrdom with invincible Constancy, (as has been observed;) I say I have hopes, that what this great and good Man then wrote,

wrote, will have an Influence on serious Christians, so as to induce them to lay aside their Prejudices, and to reduce such who have opposed the establish'd Government of the Church, into Communion with their Bishop; when according to this primitive Bishop, none can be united to Christ, who are not united to their Bishop; no Sacraments can be valid without him, or Persons authorized by him; such as Worship in Assemblies without his privity, or however in Opposition to him, serve the Devil. I say, when serious Christians duly consider all this, and the Honour of God, the Interest of Religion, the Peace of the Church, Christians present Comfort and future Happiness, which depend so much on the Benefits conferred by the Holy Sacraments, are concerned in this: I have reason to hope that all this will persuade them to be at Unity with the Bishop, and to forsake those Communion that are kept up in Opposition to the Bishop, nay even to Episcopacy it self; especially, when this has been the Government that has continued in the Church from the times of the Apostles in all Ages for 1500 Years after Christ: When the Adversaries of Bishops are unable to answer the Challenge that hath been made, (mentioned in the Preliminary Discourse) to shew any one Church that was not governed by Bishops.

Here I might take notice how disingenuously * *Blondell* makes use of a Passage out of *St. Polycarp's* Epistle to the *Philippians*, which he thinks favours his Cause, when that Epistle was written to recommend *St. Ignatius's* Epistles to that Church of *Philippi*, the Authority of which he denies, when it is equal with that of *Polycarp's*, and is asserted by his Epistle; and when those Epistles fully and exprelly declare the Authority of Bishops over Presbyters, which he endeavours to overthrow by a far-fetcht Consequence from an Expression in *St. Polycarp's* Epistle; which

* Vide *Blon. p. 14.*

is, "Wherefore you ought to abstain from these things, being subject to the Presbyters and Deacons, as to God and to Christ." For, (1) Tho' at that time the Word *Presbyter* came to be appropriated to the second Order of Priesthood, yet under that Name Bishops might be included, and that in Distinction from Deacons; as the High-Priest, and the other Priests in the Jewish Church, tho' distinct Offices, are yet frequently both included in the Holy Scriptures and *Philo*, in the Word *Priests*, and this in Distinction from the *Levites*. Besides, (2) It is very probable that at that time there was no Bishop in the Church of *Philippi*; and not improbable that the *Philippians* might, upon the Death of their Bishop, till another was set over them, request Counsel of this great Man, how they should act. This his own Words seem to intimate. "These things, Brethren, I write to you, ἐν ἑμῶντος ἐμ-
" τρέψας, not induced thereto from my self, but be-
" cause you have besought me." It may be *Valens* the Presbyter was concerned in this. However, in a Case where things are so uncertain, when all Circumstances are duly considered, here's no Foundation for those Conclusions which *Blondell* would deduce from those Words of *Polycarp*.

The Inscription of the Epistle shews there were Presbyters in the Church of *Smyrna*, and that *Polycarp* distinguishes himself from those his Presbyters, and declares his Superiority over them, when he sets only his own Name to the Epistle, and expresses the other only under the general Name of Presbyters. And hence *Irenæus*, in confuting Hereticks, appeals to the Successors, not of the Presbyters of that Church, but of *Polycarp*, (l. 3. c. 3.) whom he styles Bishop of *Smyrna*, and takes him for such in the proper Acceptation of that Word, (as others have observed) as himself was Bishop of the Church of *Lyons*, in which he had been before a Presbyter. So that here we have in this Epistle a Bishop with his

Pres-

Pres
this
the
to t
mon
whic
thos

Bish
B
th
B

T
Bisho
wher
na, P
wrote
thorin
tests,
Earth
ted, t
Churc
fided.
the fir
der w
some
(of w
expect
where
Churc
Nay,

Presbyters in the Church of *Smyrna*. But besides this, when *Polycarp* herein gives his Testimony to the Epistles of *Ignatius*, when he recommends them to the *Philippians*, he at the same time gives his Testimony for Bishops and their Authority in the Church, which is so frequently asserted and inculcated in those excellent Epistles.

CHAP. VIII.

Bishops in many Churches of Asia, known by their meeting in Synods, and their Epistles; as also in Europe: And by the Appeals made to the Succession of Bishops from the time of the Apostles.

THUS we have seen in the time of *Ignatius*, who was a Disciple of some of the Apostles, that Bishops were settled in Churches; as in *Antioch*, where he himself was Bishop, and at *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, *Philadelphia*, *Trallis*, &c. to which Churches he wrote Epistles, mentions their Bishops, and the Authority wherewith they were invested; and withal attests, that Bishops were in the utmost Limits of the Earth; so that wherever Christianity was propagated, this Government was established; and wherever Churches were planted, there likewise Bishops presided. 'Tis true, we have but a slender Account of the first Bishops of many Churches: And no wonder when we have no Records of the Plantation of some Churches of singular Eminence, as of *Carthage*, (of which in the next Chapter) much less can we expect it of Churches of lesser Note. But generally, wherever in ancient Writers we have any mention of Churches, we have also mention of their Bishops. Nay, in all probability we should have had no notice

tice of several Churches, had there been no occasion to mention their Bishops. And farther, we should have had no Knowledge of many of the first Bishops, but only from some incidental Mention of them, either as met in *Synods*, or from *Epistles* written to them, or by them, about the Concerns of the Church: Or as they, and the Succession of them from the Apostles, are appealed to for the Truth and Antiquity of Catholick Doctrines, in Controversy with Hereticks, or the like Occasions; which yet are of this Use to us, to shew us, that the Church in those first Ages, was governed by Bishops. In reference to the first of these, the meeting of Bishops in *Synods*, we have some Intimation in their opposing the Heresy of the *Montanists* or *Cataphrygians*: For we are told, how not only some particular Bishops, as *Apollinaris* Bishop of *Hierapolis* in *Asia minor*, confuted them by their Writings; but also how several other Bishops jointly endeavoured to put a stop to their Delusions; as may be seen in the Epistle of *Serapion* Bishop of *Antioch*, given us by *Eusebius*, *H. E. l. 5. c. 19.* where having told us that *Apollinaris* express his Detestation of *Montanism*, he adds, that many other Bishops joined with him in condemning that Heresy; and particularly *Ælius Publius Julius* Bishop of *Develtum* in *Thrace*: And withal, that *Sotas* Bishop of *Anchialus* would have cast the evil Spirit out of *Priscilla*, but was repulsed by her hypocritical Accomplices. And then saith, that there were the Subscriptions of many other Bishops who consented with them under their own Hands subjoined to that Epistle; which intimates their assembling to that purpose: And hence 'tis probable, from the Author of the *Synodicon* published by *Pappus*, and after by *Iustellus*, that they did meet in Synod for the Condemnation of *Montanus*, tho' withal, the learned Mr. *Dodwell*, my honoured Friend, supposes it probable, that the Author of that *Synodicon* might have the Advantage of seeing *Eusebius's* History of Mar-

tyrs

tyrs now lost, which might give an Account of that, and some other Synods mentioned by that Author. However, whether they met Synodically (as is most probable) or not, 'tis evident there were Bishops that governed the Church at that time, viz. at the latter end of the second, and beginning of the third Century; and that these look'd upon themselves oblig'd to oppose Hereticks and Innovators who endeavoured to disturb the Peace of the Church, which was entrusted to their Care and Management.

Withal, we find about that time, or a little before it, express Mention of Bishops assembled about the Controversy of the Time when *Easter* should be observed; Συνοδοι καὶ Συνελεύσεις ἐπισκόπων, *Euseb. H. E. l. 5. c. 23.* So c. 24, 25. and this in several Parts of the World: By which we may conclude the universal Establishment of Bishops in all Countries where the Gospel was entertained, as expressly in some particular Countries presently to be named. Such *Firmilian* tells us were assembled at *Iconium* in *Phrygia*, from *Galatia*, *Cilicia*, and other neighbouring Countries. *Ep. 75. Cypr.*

The like might be observed from the Epistles that in those first Ages were written by Bishops to each other, or to Churches, as the Concerns of the Church made it requisite: Some of which are preserved by *Eusebius*; which I shall presently have occasion to mention; only here observe, that *Thelymidres* Bishop of *Laodicea*, is mention'd, to which Church *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria* wrote an Epistle. *Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 46.* Where also *Meruzanes* Bishop of the *Armenians*, and *Helenus* Bishop of *Tarsus*, and others assembled with him, besides several more, are there mention'd.

From both these 'tis manifest, that Bishops were settled in *Asia*, where most of the Synods of the first Ages, the Names of which are transmitted to us, were held. This appears from the Epistle of *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus* to *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*,

con-

concerning the Paschal Controversy ; wherein he takes notice of *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*, of *Thra-seas* Bishop of *Eumenia*, and *Sagaris* Bishop of *Laodicea*. *Polycrates* also tells *Victor*, that there had been seven Bishops of *Ephesus*, of his own Kindred, and he the eighth, which must, if there were no more, bring the Succession of Bishops of that City, near to the times of the Apostles.

Here I must digress to consider a Passage of *Epiphanius* cited by *Blondel*,^a in order to assert the Authority of Presbyters. In brief it is this : That the Heretick *Noetus* was cited, tried and condemned by the Presbyters of *Ephesus*, which intimates the Right which Presbyters have in governing the Church. Here (1) I observe that for the Fact *Epiphanius* cites no Author, and is himself too late to be a Witness of what was transacted 130 Years (for so many Years *Blondel* himself out of *Epiphanius* computes it) before his own time : To omit the acknowledged Injudiciousness and Unaccuracy of that Father, (2) 'Tis evident that *Ephesus* was all along governed by Bishops, by the *Angel* of that Church, *Rev.* 2. 1. (of which before) by *Polycrates* who was Bishop there, before the time assigned for *Noetus*, besides seven of his Kindred that had been his Predecessors ; so that none can justly infer from this Instance, that this Church was governed by Presbyters. But (3) Admitting the Fact to be true, for which we have only *Epiphanius's* Word, in all probability it was acted in the Vacancy of the See, (in the Interval betwixt the Death of one Bishop, and the Election of another,) the Presbyters, thro' the Necessity of the Church, assuming this Power to themselves ; and it may be in a time of Persecution, this being about the Time of *Decius*. And we know not but that they might act as the Clergy of *Rome* did in a like Vacancy, *collatione Conciliorum cum Episcopis*,

^a *Bl. Apolog.* p. 199, 200.

by Conference [and Concurrence with] Neighbour Bishops, who might be at that time at *Ephesus* the chief City of the *Lydian Asia*. At the most, 'tis but a single Instance, and so not a sufficient Foundation for the Power of Presbyters.

But to return from this Digression. *Polycrates*, after the former Bishops, names *Papirius*, whom we may conclude likewise was a Bishop, tho' he names not of what City; and also *Melito*, who was placed at *Sardis*. He afterwards tells *Victor* of the Bishops that were on that occasion met together synodically, and therefore presided over Churches in those parts; and that if he should write down their Names, πολλὰ πολλὴν εἶσιν, it would be a large Catalogue. From which we may infer, that the Churches in those Parts were universally governed by Bishops.

Before I proceed farther, I observe that these Synods mentioned by *Polycrates*, were Provincial. Now that Provincial Synods consisted of Bishops, and that they alone, and not Presbyters had Right to vote in them, *Dr. Wake*, now Bishop of *Lincoln*, evinces by Canons, by imperial Laws enforcing those Canons, and by the Practice both of the Eastern and Western Church. See his *State of the Church*, p. 95, &c.

Farther, we find in an Epistle preserved by *Eusebius*,^b which gives an Account of the *Montanists*, written to *Avircius Marcellus* (who by some is called Bishop of *Hierapolis*) there is mention of *Zoticus* Bishop of *Comana*, and *Julian* of *Apamea*. And 'in an Epistle of *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*, to the Church of *Amastria* in *Pontus*, he mentions *Palma* their Bishop; and^d *Eusebius* mentions the Letters of the Bishops of *Pontus* in the Paschal Controversy. From which 'tis manifest, that that Government was settled in many Countries of *Asia*. We have seen

^b *Euseb. H. E. l. 5. c. 16.* ^c *Id. l. 4. 23.* ^d *Id. l. 5. c. 23*
And there the Letters of the Bishops of the Province of *Osroena*.

how early it was in *Syria*, in that eminent Martyr *Ignatius*, Bishop of *Antioch*, whose Successors ^c *Eusebius* recounts, two of them famous for their Writings, viz. *Theophilus* and *Serapion*, and another infamous for his Heresy, viz. *Paulus Samosatenus*. But to pass over other Countries of *Asia*, we find early mention of the Bishops in *Palestine*; particularly at the Mother Church of *Jerusalem*. For besides them, (of whom before) who were of the Circumcision till *Adrian's* time, ^f *Eusebius* recounts their Successors of the *Gentile* Extraction, being eleven down to *Narcissus*, ^e who being (tho' falsely) accused of high Crimes, retired; how on his Retirement *Pius*, &c. governed that Church; and that after his Return, *Alexander*, in his extreme old Age, assisted him, and after his Death succeeded him. This *Alexander* had been, before his Call by a Revelation to *Jerusalem*, Bishop in *Cappadocia*; which shews that the Churches in that Country were governed by Bishops: And he had under him a Presbyter named *Clemens*, by whom he sent an Epistle to the Church of *Antioch*; which shews that Presbyters were in those days a distinct Office from Bishops, and subject to them. ^h *Eusebius* also shews, that there was a Synod of Bishops of *Palestine* assembled concerning the time of celebrating *Easter*, whose Epistle was extant in his time, in which *Theophilus* Bishop of *Casarea* in *Palestine*, presided; which shews how that Church was governed then by Bishops, as it was afterwards to the time of *Eusebius*, who was Bishop thereof, and ⁱ has left us the Names of his Predecessors in that See: And tells us likewise, ^k that *Clarus* Bishop of *Ptolemais*, and *Cassius* Bishop of *Tyre*, were assembled with the Bishops before named, about the Paschal

^a *Euseb. H. E. l. 4. 20, 24. & l. 5. c. 19. & l. 6. c. 20.*

^e *Id. l. 5. c. 12.* ^e *Id. l. 6. c. 8, 9, 10, 11.* ^h *Id. l. 5. c. 23.*

ⁱ *Id. l. 7. c. 14.*

^k *Id. l. 5. c. 25.*

Controversy: Which manifests how those Cities were then governed, as the other Churches before recited. And this was in the Reign of *Commodus*, who was kill'd about the Year of our Lord 190.

So likewise in the Controversy about re-baptizing Hereticks, *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, in his Epistle to the Churches, (*Euseb. H. E. l. 7. c. 5.*) names *Demetrianus* Bishop of *Antioch*, *Theoctistus* of *Casarea*, *Mazabanes* of *Ælia*, *Marinus* of *Tyre*, *Heliodorus* of *Laodicea*, *Helenus* of *Tarsus*, besides many others; for he had room only to name the most eminent, as he speaks. And in his Epistle to *Philemon*, (*Ibid. c. 7.*) He tells him that what he had written about rebaptizing Hereticks, he had it not from the *Africans*, but that it had been decreed by Bishops before his own time, that assembled at *Iconium* and *Synada*, and by many others.

Farther, to evince that the Churches in *Asia* were governed by Bishops in those first Ages, might be shewn from the Council that was assembled at *Antioch* to condemn *Paulus Samosatensis* Bishop of that City, tho' after the former Council, yet in the third Century, *A. D. 277.* There we find Bishops from many places, in that short Account which ¹ *Eusebius* has given us, viz. *Gregory* and *Athenodorus* from *Pontus*, *Helenus* from *Cilicia*, being Bishop of *Tarsus*, *Nicomas* of *Iconium* from *Lycaonia*, *Maximus* of *Bosstra*, from *Arabia*, and the renowned *Firmilian* of *Casarea* from *Cappadocia*, who dyed in his Journey to the Council, besides the Bishops of *Jerusalem* and *Casarea* from *Palestine*. To pass over here *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, who by his Letters to the Council, concurred with them in the Condemnation of *Paulus*. Here I might by the way shew, how groundless the Notion of Congregational Episcopacy is, and the Opposition of Diocesan, from this Synod, which has been observed by others. *Eusebius* ^m tells us,

¹ *Euseb. H. E. l. 7. c. 28.*

^m *Ibid. c. 29.*

112 *An History of the Government*

that it consisted of very many Bishops, (*ἡ ἀπειρος ὄρεσις*; which *Valesius* translates, *innumerabilium fere Episcoporum*) and this out of many distant Nations; as is evident from the Bishop of *Cappadocia*, and of *Egypt*'s Intention of coming to it, tho' prevented; the one, *Firmilian*, by Death, the other, *Dionysius*, by old Age: And yet *Athanasius* (in his Tract concerning the Councils of *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*) makes it to consist only of seventy Bishops. As the Persons of which this Council was composed, evince that the Churches in those parts were then governed by Bishops; so the small Number of them, considering it consisted of several Nations, and those at that time very populous, and of a large Circuit, and some at a great Distance from each other, shews how little ground there is to confine Bishops to the Charge of single Congregations, or indeed to deny them the Government of large Districts.

As we have found by the Epistles written in those early Ages, and by Synods then assembled, that the Churches of *Asia* were governed by Bishops; so the same will appear with respect to the Churches of *Europe*. Particularly, that this Government was settled in *Greece*, appears from the Epistles of *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*, who flourished in the Reign of *M. Aurelius Antoninus*, and of *Soter* Bishop of *Rome*, (to whom he wrote) who dyed in the Year of Christ 178. He being concerned for the Welfare of other Churches as well as his own, wrote several Epistles to them. Among others, to the Church of *Athens*; wherein he blames them for not following the Pattern set them by their Bishop *Publius*, who suffered Martyrdom for the Christian Faith: And then takes notice of *Quadratus* who succeeded *Publius*, by whose Diligence their Zeal, especially in frequent Assembling for the Worship of God, was revived. He withal puts them in mind not only of

their Bishops in his own time, but one immediately placed there in the Apostles time, viz. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, who was their first Bishop: And no wonder, when he was ἀπαρχή, of the first Fruits of *Attica*, who were usually chosen to that, and other sacred Offices in the Church. The same *Dionysius* of *Corinth*, in his Epistle to the Church at *Gortyna*, together with others in *Crete*, highly extols their Bishop *Philip* for his worthy Performances, which were justly celebrated among them; as he does in that to the *Gnossians*, their Bishop *Pynitus*, for his Faith and solicitous Care for his Flock, as well as his Eloquence and Skill in divine Truths.

As for the Government of the Churches in *France*, we may know it from one instance, viz. that of the Church of *Lyons*, which we are assured had a Bishop, from the Account given us of his Martyrdom, and his courageous Suffering in the Cause of Christ, tho' above 90 Years old, by the ° Epistle of that Church of *Lyons*, and of that of *Vienna* to the Churches of *Asia* and *Phrygia*, wherein they recount the glorious Sufferings of many excellent Champions in the Cause of Christ; as we have afterwards Knowledge of his Successor *Irenaus*, of whom more presently.

As for the Churches of *Italy*, we may presume that they were governed by Bishops very early, when the Church of the chief City thereof, and after that time the chief City of the World, *Rome*, was governed by Bishops, and those in a direct Succession from the Apostles themselves, as has been in part shewn already, and will presently be fully evidenced. The Synods at *Rome*, as that ^p in the Paschal Controversy, must, as all other Synods in those Days did, consist of Bishops, and hence manifests that Bishops were settled in Churches neighbouring upon that imperial City.

There was another Occasion given, from which we may be acquainted who were the Bishops of some

• *Enseb. H. E. l. 5. c. 1.*

• *Ibid. c. 23.*

114 *An History of the Government*

particular Churches, and also be assured that the Catholick Church was governed by Bishops from the time of the Apostles; and that was by the *Appeal* made by the Orthodox to the Bishops of *Apostolic Churches* for the Truth and Antiquity of Christian Doctrines. The Abettors of Heresies, which were broached in those early Days, pretended that what they taught, was taught by the Apostles, and delivered down to the Perfect by some *Cabala* which they kept secret among themselves. Now in this Case, the Orthodox appealed to the Bishops of Churches founded by the Apostles. It was justly presumed on both Sides, that that Doctrine was true which was taught by the Apostles. Now the Catholicks shew, that what the Hereticks taught, as it is not to be found in the Writings of the Apostles, so was it not transmitted by any other Tradition; because whatever Doctrine the Apostles delivered, was given as a *Depositum* to the Bishops, whom they placed in the Churches which they planted, and these Bishops transmitted the same to their Successors. On which occasion, these ancient Fathers take notice of Bishops that were placed in such Churches by the Apostles, and recount them that follow them in a continued Succession to their own time, from whom we must expect the Delivery of such Doctrines. Of this we have three considerable Instances. The first is of *Hegeſippus*, who travelled for this end, that he might be acquainted with the Doctrines and Traditions of the Apostles, which he sought for in the Churches founded by 'em; some Remains of whose Writings are preserved by *Eusebius*. He ^a tells us, that he lived in the Reign of *Adrian*, (who immediately succeeded *Trajan*, in whose time *St. John* dyed) ^c that he went to *Corinth*, where *Primus* was Bishop, and from thence to *Rome* (the great imperial City, being most likely to afford him Information) “ And

^a *Euseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 8.*

^c *Euseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 22.*

“ there he conversed with many Bishops, from whom
 “ he received one and the same Doctrine.” After
 he tells us, “ That whilst he abode at Rome,
 “ *Ἐκδοχὴν ἐποίησά μιν μέχρις Ἀνικλήτου*, he drew a
 “ Succession down to *Anicetus*, (who was then Bi-
 “ shop of that Church) whose Deacon *Eleuther-*
 “ *us* then was.” And then takes notice, “ That
 “ *Soter* succeeded *Anicetus*, after whom was *Elen-*
 “ *therus*. And says, “ That in all the Successions
 “ of Bishops, and in each City, the same Doctrine
 “ was taught, *viz.* that which was taught by the Law
 and the Prophets, and “ by our Lord himself.” He
 afterwards gives the Reason why “ *Thebuthis* became
 an Heretick, *viz.* “ because he was not made a Bi-
 shop;” which shews that Episcopacy was the Govern-
 ment of that Church of which he was a Member.

But he who chiefly handles this Argument, who
 lived near the same time, and had seen *Polycarp* the
 Disciple of St. *John*, was *Irenaus*; who (as I may
 observe by the way) was first a Presbyter, and af-
 terwards a Bishop of the Church of *Lyons* in France.
 As a Presbyter he is recommended to *Eleutherus* Bi-
 shop of Rome, by the Martyrs of *Lyons*, while they
 were in Prison; and after the Martyrdom of *Potho-*
nus, whom the Church of *Lyons* style their Bishop
 at the time of his Suffering, he succeeded him as Bi-
 shop of that City; and consequently was one who
 successively bore both Offices in that Church. This
 Account is solidly vindicated from the Cavils of
Blondel, by the learned Bishop *Pearson*. “ But to re-
 turn: This *Irenaus*, in his Books against the Here-
 ticks that pester’d the Church in his time, shews,
 that notwithstanding their Pretences, they could not
 prove theirs to be the Doctrine of the Apostles; for
 as it was not to be found in their Writings, so nei-
 ther could it be proved that it was delivered down

¹ *Euseb. H. E. l. 5. c. 4.*

² *Ibid. c. 5. Hieronym. Catalog.*

³ *Vindic. Ep. Ignat. part 2. cap. 13. p. 158, &c.*

116 *An History of the Government*

from them by any undoubted Tradition. To manifest which, he makes the following Appeal. * “ We
 “ can faith he) reckon up those who were by the
 “ Apostles ordained Bishops in Churches, and those
 “ who were their Successors, to our own time.
 “ These never taught nor knew any of the wild Opinions of these Men. If the Apostles had known these hidden Mysteries, which [as these Hereticks pretend] they by themselves secretly taught the Perfect, they would with a special care have delivered the same to those Persons to whom they committed the Churches themselves, [*i. e.* to the Bishops] for they would be desirous that those should be perfect and unblameable in every thing, whom they left to be their Successors, and to whom they consigned their Authority.—But because it would be too tedious to reckon up the Succession of all Churches, I shall instance in that of *Rome*, as being very great, antient, and known of all, and was founded and constituted by the two glorious Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, and shews its Tradition [or Doctrine delivered] which it had from the Apostles, and which Faith it declared to Men, and which by the Succession of Bishops, hath been conveyed down to us, and hereby confound these Men.—And then adds (which *Eusebius* hath preserved in its Original) “ The blessed Apostles having founded and established that Church, committed the Ministry of it to *Linus* as its Bishop, whom *Paul* mentions in his Epistles to *Timothy*. *Anencletus* succeeded him. After him in the third Place, *Clemens*. — And then names the several Bishops in their Succession down to *Eleutherus*, who was Bishop of that Church when *Irenaeus* was writing his Book. In which place, as he derives the Doctrine which the Apostles taught from their time down to his own, as conveyed by a

* *Iren. adv. Hares.* l. 3. c. 3.

* *Euseb. H. E.* l. 5. c. 6.

continued Succession of Bishops; so he derives this Succession of Bishops from the Apostles themselves, the first of whom he makes to succeed the Apostles in the Government of the Church, as they afterwards succeeded one another. After this he instances also in the Churches of *Asia*, particularly that of *Smyrna*, over which was *Polycarp*, (who was instructed by the Apostles, and had conversed with them who had seen our Lord) was by the Apostles constituted Bishop, whom *Irenaus* testifies he had seen in his younger Years. But this I have already mentioned.

Another, who lived a little after that time, the ancientest of all the Latin Fathers that are extant, disputes against the Hereticks from the same Topic, viz. *Tertullian*. This he doth in his excellent Treatise *De Prascript. Cap. 32.* where he challenges the Hereticks "To produce the Original of their Churches, and to shew the Succession of their Bishops from the Beginning, so as to make it appear that the first of their Bishops had an Apostle, or some Apostolick Person, who persisted with the Apostles, for his Author [or Ordainer] or Predecessor. For thus Apostolick Churches [*census suos deferunt*] produce the Registers [or Records] of their Extraction; as the Church of the *Smyrneans* [their Bishop] *Polycarp*, settled there by *John*; the *Romans* their *Clement*, ordained by *Peter*; answerably to what other Churches do, who prove their Apostolick Original, [or that they are the Posterity of the Apostles] (*Apostolici seminis tra- duces habeant*) by exhibiting them who were constituted their Bishops by the Apostles." Where *Tertullian* supposes this, as a thing on all hands granted, that the Apostles placed Bishops in all the Churches which they planted; and instances particularly in that of *Rome*. Accordingly, in his Controversy with *Marcion*, he proves the Novelty of this Heretick's Opinions, and the Antiquity, and thence the

Truth of the Catholick Doctrine, from *Marcion's* being unable to shew any Church embracing his Opinions, that could deduce its Original by a Descent of Bishops from the Apostles, and by shewing that the Catholicks could do it. *Adv. Marcion* l. 4. c. 3. *Habemus & Johannis. alumnas Ecclesias, &c.* "We have Churches also founded by *John*." For tho' *Marcion* rejects his Revelations, yet "The Register of the Bishops ascending up to the first. (*Ordo Episcoporum ad originem recenset*) will shew *John* to be the Author, [*i. e.* "The Ordainer of the first Bishop, and Founder of the Church] and accordingly (*ceterarum generositas recognoscitur*) "The genuine Nobility of other Churches is recognized.

The Reasoning of these Fathers proceeds on this Foundation, which they suppose as a thing unquestionable, and which their Adversaries would not deny, *viz.* That Bishops were by the Apostles set over those Churches which they planted; Persons to whom they had delivered the Christian Doctrine. To which Apostolick Churches they therefore appeal for the Truth of Doctrines. They suppose the first Bishops of those Churches placed there by the Apostles, who were by them instructed in the great Articles of the Faith, which was by them transmitted to their Successors. Now this arguing would have been unconvulsive, unless it had been agreed on all Hands, that wherever the Apostles found Churches, they therein appointed Bishops to govern them.

There is another Subject which employed some of the first Fathers of the Church, but such as will afford us little Light about the Government of the Church, but not wholly to be past over, because some Passages from thence have been insisted on in this present Case: And this is the *Apologies* they penn'd for themselves and their Fellow-Christians, and in Vindication of that excellent Religion they professed: And this in order to convince their Enemies

mies what little Reason they had to hate and persecute them, and to justify their Persecutions, and how ill they acted in maliciously charging them with Crimes of which they were not guilty, and which their Religion condemned. Among these Apologists, we find two, who both wrote about the same time, that were Bishops, viz. ¹ Melito Bishop of Sardis, and Apollonarius Bishop of Hierapolis; which shews that the Church was in that Age, viz. about the Year of Christ 170, governed by Bishops.

In these Apologies, which were usually directed to Heathens, they had little occasion to speak of their Church Government, or Governors, and hence we have no reason to expect any Account thereof from them. Their Enemies had indeed used monstrous Malignity in falsely representing their religious Assemblies, and traduced them as guilty of horrid Impurities. This put them on a necessity of giving a clear Account of what was done when they met together to worship God, and hereby occasionally to mention those Persons who performed divine Offices in their Assemblies: But seeing these might be, and were, transacted either by Bishops or Presbyters, they express them by words of a large Signification, which may denote both those Offices. Hence *S. Justin Martyr*, when he declares what was done in their Christian Assemblies, the Order observed therein, and particularly the Solemnity of the Eucharist; he neither names Bishop or Presbyter, either of whom might celebrate that divine Office, but only uses the general Word *ἐπισκοπῶν*, which might denote either of them, So that from this Passage nothing can be fairly deduced to conclude what Form of Government was then in the Church, the holy Martyr having no occasion to speak thereof, but only of the Form of God's Worship in particular Congregations. 'Tis true, he names Deacons, and what was performed peculiarly

¹ *Enseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 25.*

by them, because those were Parts of the Ministry which was their proper Office. But in respect to other Parts of God's Service, which were of an higher nature, and to be performed by a superior Minister, who might be either a Bishop or a Presbyter; when he speaks of such a Person, he uses a Word that might signify either Office.

Accordingly we ought to put a Construction on the words of *Tertullian* in his Apology, c. 39. *Præsident probati quoque Seniores*. Tho' in his Writings directed to Christians, when he has occasion to mention the Officers of the Church, he expresses them by *Episcopus* and *Presbyter*, distinguishes them from each other, and shews the Subordination of Presbyters to Bishops, (as will be farther shewn;) yet when he speaks to the Governors and Judges deputed by the Emperor and Senate of *Rome*, he confines not himself to ecclesiastical Words, but uses such as were of more ordinary use, and best known to them. Such was the Word *Seniores*, which denoted the chief Governours of any Community, a Word fitted to signify them, as it carries in it self the Original of Government, which was at first in the Elders or Heads of Families: And therefore fitted to express to Strangers those who were the chief Governours of the Church, and not inferior Presbyters, tho' the Word *Seniores* seems at first sight fitter to denote them. But however, merely from the use of this one Word, which may signify both Offices, to conclude that *Tertullian* makes Bishops and Presbyters to be of equal Authority, or the same Office; especially, when in other places of his Works he has declared the contrary, (as will be shewn) is of the same nature, as if any should infer, that a Presbyter is of equal Authority with an Apostle, because *St. Peter* 1 *Pet.* 5. 1. styles himself *συμπρεσβύτερον*, a Fellow-Presbyter: Or that the common Soldiers among the *Romans* were equal with their Emperors and Generals, because called by them *Commilitones*, Fel-

low

low-
ral,
man
inve
tion
it is
ches
ther
poin
Brib
Wo
the f
no f
one
" L
" a
" fa
" C
" P
" C
" ri
A
Boo
rece
Pra
this
pow
I fe
or i
of o
dotes
in t
cann
ans
Han
Mar
Apo
Pres
σω τ

low-Soldiers. As for the Word *Seniores* being plural, from thence to conclude, that there must be many Presbyters or Elders in one particular Church invested with equal Authority, 'tis a bold and irrational Inference; when it is more probable, that it is spoken of Governours in general of all Churches; and then all that can fairly be understood thereby, is that generally in Churches such were appointed to preside, who obtained that Dignity not by Bribes, but their own Merit. But supposing the Word *Seniores* to signify a Bench of Presbyters in the same Church, from thence to infer that there was no single Person presiding over this Bench, is, (as one expresses it) " No less than to give the broad " Lie to *Tertullian* himself; when he has so often " and so expressly told us (as has been, and will be " farther shewn) that there was one in every " Church endued with so much Power over the " Presbyterate, that they could act nothing in the " Church, but in Subordination to his Authority.

As for that Expression of *Tertullian's* in his Book *De coronâ militis*, c. 3. that Christians did receive the Eucharist from the hands of none but *Præsidentium*, such as presided in the Church, when this may signify either Bishops or Presbyters empowered by the Bishops to consecrate the Elements, I see not how it affects the Cause of Episcopacy, or is at all repugnant to the Doctrine or Practice of our Church; when this Word, as well as *Sacerdotes*, &c. may be applied to both Offices, of which in the Preface. Tho' withal, this of *Tertullian* cannot be taken in the strictest sense, that Christians always received the sacred Elements from the Hands either of Bishop or Presbyter; in that *Justin Martyr*, who lived a little before him, testifies (in his Apology near the end) that after the *πρεσβυς*, the President had consecrated, the Deacons *διδόασιν ἑα-*
σθαι τὸ παρόντων ἀγαλλασθαι ὑπο τῷ ἀχαριστηθῆναι ἄλλῃ,
καὶ οὕτως,

καὶ διὰς, καὶ ὁ δατος, καὶ τοῖς ἑ παρῶν ἀποπέμποι, gave to each of them that were present, to partake of the consecrated Bread and Wine and Water, and carried it to them that were absent. So that if we take *Præsidentes* in the strictest sense to signify Bishops; all we can understand by that Passage, is, that Christians received the Eucharist that had been consecrated by the Bishop in Congregations where he officiated, and in other Congregations from them who received their Authority from him, viz. from Presbyters, who withal may be styled *Præsidentes*, as they were superior to Deacons.

However, tho' these Apologies help us not in the Case before us; yet others, early Writers, who lived next to the time of the Apostles, give sufficient Testimony that Episcopal Government was every where established, and this as derived from the Apostles. Now, when these Fathers, whom we must suppose well acquainted with the State of the Church in their own time, and not ignorant of it in the time immediately preceding, (especially when they had the Archives of the Church to consult,) give us an Account of Bishops settled in Churches, presiding therein, distinct from, and superior to Presbyters; and do appeal to the Succession of Bishops from the times of the Apostles, and this in the most considerable Cities in the World, and in an Age so near the Apostles, we must quite lay aside whatever is delivered to us in History, if we call in question, and much more deny what is thus attested. We can have no reason to suspect the Integrity and Sincerity of these holy Men, who were ready to sacrifice their Ease, Estates, Liberty and Life it self for Christ's sake; and had no sinister secular Interest to carry on, neither can we imagine what they could have in the present Case. And we have as little reason to question their Knowledge of what they deliver, in which 'tis almost impossible they should be mista-

mist
Bish
bers
ches
an A
lar C
the
inde
were
of C
shoul
dent

Of

SO
u
the T
respe
with
of gr
Dema
we ca
ny Na
And i
Churc
first C
for a
find a
Bishop
themse
ches o

mistaken; as in telling who were in their own time Bishops of the Churches of which they were Members, or the Bishops of eminent Cities, or of Churches that were near them: As also, when they give an Account of the Succession of Bishops in particular Churches from the times of the Apostles, from the Archives of those Churches. Our Adversaries indeed would have us believe, that these Bishops were not superior to Presbyters, nor the Governours of Churches; but they give no Reason why we should thus think, nay the contrary thereto is evident by what has been produced.

C H A P. IX.

*Of the planting of Churches in Ægypt,
and the Succession of Bishops there.*

SOME of the Adversaries of Episcopacy call on us to shew a continued *Succession* of *Bishops* from the Times of the Apostles. This has been done with respect to some eminent Churches: But if required with respect to all, nay to many Churches that were of great Reputation, the Unreasonableness of the Demand will appear, in that it must be owned that we cannot give an Account of the *Conversion* of many Nations, where we find many eminent Churches. And if we are at a Loss about the founding of the Churches, 'tis no wonder we should be so for the first Governours of those Churches, and still more for a Succession of them. And we shall generally find as early an Account transmitted to us of the Bishops of Churches, as we have of the Churches themselves; as will appear in reference to the Churches of *Afric*, which I shall particularly consider.

It

It may seem strange to us, that when the Apostles first preached the Gospel to Persons of Jewish Extraction, we find no mention of their preaching in *Egypt*, where from *Philo* and *Josephus* it appears that there were such vast Multitudes of that Nation, and some of these were (as is plain from *Acts* 2. 10.) Witnesses of the miraculous Effusion of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles, and were thereby, by seeing the extraordinary Effects thereof, prepared to entertain the Gospel: I say, we may wonder that we hear nothing of the Apostles Labours there, and the answerable Success thereof, which every where accompanied them. Especially, if we consider the great Multitude of the *Essens* or *Therapeutæ* in *Egypt*, which *Philo* tells us of, who were by their Principles so much prepared to embrace Christianity, and so nearly approached to it, that *Eusebius* [*H. E.* 1. 2. c. 16, 17.] supposes from what *Philo* reports of their Retirement, their parting with their Possessions, their Oratories, their reading and expounding the Law and the Prophets, their Fasts, their Hymns, &c. that they were Christians. From which, tho' a Mistake, we may reasonably infer, how likely these were to embrace Christianity on its being preached to them; and withal, have reason to conclude, that they generally did so, when we hear nothing of them after those times. And if these were Converts, we may reasonably suppose many other *Jews* were so also, who were there so numerous; and likewise many of the *Gentiles*, according to the glorious Success of the Apostles Labours in other Countries. Nay, we are assured hereof, from the Epistle that the Emperor *Adrian* wrote to *Servianus*, which is preserved by *Vopiscus* in the Life of *Saturninus*, where he mentions the *Christians* in *Egypt*, and these not merely as a Sect, but as very considerable. Yet we have neither in the *Acts* of the Apostles (which indeed, after the Dispersion of the Apostles, chiefly relate the Progress of the Gospel under St. *Peter*, and

and
Mon
of t
pre
wer
Cou
stim
shop
Acc
stran
vern
cern
Alex
shop
" fir
" G
" C
press
as de
shop
" we
" fe
from
been
befor
fle n
he by
was t
dersto
nion
serie
Th
" eig
" Ma
" the
" Al
" Go

" *Euse*

and especially under St. Paul,) nor from any other Monuments, any Account left us of the Conversion of those Nations, besides that scanty one in *Eusebius*, presently to be mentioned; notwithstanding there were so many learned Christian Writers of that Country, as *Clemens*, *Origen* and others, whose Testimony for the Government of the Church by Bishops, we shall have occasion to observe. And if the Account of their Conversion is so defective, 'tis not strange that should be so, which concerns their Governours. But indeed what *Eusebius* delivers concerning the Conversion of *Egypt*, and its chief City *Alexandria*, equally declares its Government by Bishops. He tells us ^a of a Report, "That *Mark* was first sent into *Egypt*; that he there published the Gospel that he had written; and that he settled Churches in the City of *Alexandria*, (which Expression of Churches, implies several Congregations, as doth that which follows, tho' all under one Bishop, as we shall see presently)" and that there "were Multitudes of Men and Women, who professed the Christian Faith;" which he concludes from the vast Number of *Therapeutæ*, whom (as has been observed) he mistook for Christians. A little before he had observed, that St. *Peter* in his first Epistle mentions St. *Mark*, and that from *Rome*, which he by a Trope there calls *Babylon*, which he says was the Opinion of some: May it not rather be understood of *Babylon* in *Egypt*? According to the Opinion of the excellent Bishop *Pearson*, *Dissertat. 1. de serie Roman. Episcop. c. 8. S. 7.*

The same Historian tells us, ^b "That in the eighth Year of *Nero's* Reign, the first, who after *Mark* the Apostle and Evangelist, succeeded in the Government of the Diocese (*παροικία*) of *Alexandria*, was *Annianus*, a Man beloved of God, and in every respect admirable. And after-

^a *Euseb. H. E. l. 2. c. 16.*

^b *Euseb. H. E. l. 2. c. 24.*

wards, ' that in the fourth Year of *Domitian*,
 " *Annianus*, who had been first Bishop of *Alexan-*
 " *dria*, and that for 22 Years, dyed;" and that
Avilius, who was the second succeeded him. And af-
 terwards gives us the Names of them who succeeded,
 in the course of his History, viz. *Cerdo*, *Primus*,
Iustus, *Eumenes*, *Marius*, *Celadion*, *Agrippinus*, *De-*
metrius, *Heraclas*, *Dionysius*, *Maximus*, *Theonas*,
Petrus, *Achillas*, and *Alexander*, who was Bishop
 there in his own time, the time of the *Nicene* Coun-
 cil, in the occasion of which he was concerned. From
 which 'tis as evident that the Church of *Alexan-*
dria was governed by Bishops, and in a continued
 Succession, as that there was a Church in that City.

Nay farther, this is manifest even from *St. Jerome*
 himself; ' who tho' he mentions something peculiar
 in the Election of the Bishops of that Church
 (which will be afterwards considered; yet he owns
 that after their Election they were *excelsiori gradu*
collocati, placed in an higher Station; and invested
 thereby with Authority even over the Presbyters,
quomodo si Exercitus Imperatorem faciat, as 'tis when
 an Army makes a General. The making him their
 General, gives him thereby Authority over them.

As for the Expression of *facere*, whatever it may
 signify, it cannot denote the Presbyters ordaining their
 Bishop, when *St. Jerome* in that same Place reserves
Ordination as the peculiar Prerogative of the Bishop.
Quid facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Pres-
byter non faciat? And farther, 'tis evident that
St. Jerome doth own, as *Eusebius* had done, a conti-
 nued Succession of Bishops in that See, from *St. Mark*
 downwards. As for the peculiar Custom he mentions,
 it were to be wish'd that he had told us from whom
 he had received that Tradition, that we might have
 made the better Judgment of its Authority, and how
 far we might have depended on it; for he lived too

* *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 14.*

d *Hieron. Ep. ad Evag.*

late to be himself an Evidence. However, from what he tells us, especially when agreeing with *Eusebius*, 'tis evident that the Church of *Alexandria* was, even from the Apostles times, all along governed by Bishops; as appears not only from the names of the Bishops, but also from the worthy Monuments of one of them, viz. *Dionysius*; (for some excellent Remains of which we are obliged to *Eusebius*;) and also from some historical Passages of some of those Bishops who lived at, and a little before the time when *Arius* broached his Heresy. Nay this appears from *Adrian's* Epistle to *Servianus* (before cited) where Bishops are mentioned in the Country of *Egypt*, and these as distinct from Presbyters, and therefore certainly in *Alexandria* the chiefest City thereof, to which the Emperor had a special Respect in that Epistle.

As for what the *Arabic* Historian *Eutychius* has left to us, 'tis scarce worth mentioning, considering the lateness of the time wherein he wrote, viz. the tenth Century; his not producing any ancient Authors for what he tells us of former times, the Inconsistency of his Narratives with more authentick Historians, nay even with themselves. For tho' Mr. *Selden* set a value on him, by calling him the *Egyptian Bede*, and equalling him with that Historian tho' living two Hundred Years after him, and who did not as *Bede* relate the Affairs of his own time; by supposing that he consulted the Archives of the Church of *Alexandria*, tho' *Abulfarajus* tells us how *Amrus Ebnol*, when he took *Alexandria*, burnt the Library. No, instead of this, he has patch'd an History out of several Authors not consistent with themselves, nor with other ancient credible Historians. This the Reader may find largely and learnedly made out by Bishop *Pearson* in his *Vindic. Ignat.* P. 1. c. 10. pag. 171, 172. But to name no more, the Vanity of this *Eutychius* appears in his making the Bishop of *Alexandria* to be the only Bishop of all *Egypt*; which

as

as it is contrary to what is delivered by good Authors, of other Bishops in *Egypt*, and of Synods of them, of which more presently; so 'tis of the greatest Disservice to the Adversaries of Diocesan Government, and the Advocates for Congregational Episcopacy; when by making the Bishop of *Alexandria*, Bishop of all *Egypt*, he gives him a larger District, I say not only than that of the largest of our Dioceses, but even of one of our Provinces.

From what has been said, it may as justly be questioned whether there was a Church at *Alexandria*, as whether there were Bishops there, from the time of *St. Mark*, and of the blessed Apostles; there being as clear Testimonies for this latter, as for the former.

But besides this, we have the Testimonies of Persons of singular Learning and Piety, that were Presbyters of that Church, who speak of Bishops as distinct from Presbyters, and these as settled generally in all Churches, and consequently in that whereof they were Members, and this even by the Apostles themselves. Such was *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, who is owned by *Blondel* to have written presently after *Commodus's* Death, *A. D.* 192, who after *Pantenus's* Death, was (according to *St. Jerome*) an excellent Instructor of the *Alexandrians* in Christian Philosophy, being Catechist there; one eminent for his Learning and Piety, and thus esteemed by *Alexander* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, *omnium doctissimus, illustris & beatus*. He in his *Stromateis*, l. 6. p. 667. *Edit. Paris.* speaks of Presbyters "who were honoured, "not merely because they were Presbyters, but by "reason of their Probity; that such a Presbyter "was justly honoured, tho' he was not dignified " *πρωταρχος*, with the chief Seat, or the most "eminent Dignity in the Church, to which a Presbyter had not arrived." In which Words he plainly intimates, that there was in this Church an Office superior to that of *Presbyter*, which must be that

that of a *Bishop*. This is evident by what follows a little after ; where he speaks of *Bishops*, *Priests* and *Deacons*, as distinct Offices in the Church, and these as *πρὸς ἄνω*, *gradual Advancements*. By which is implied, that as a Deacon, when chosen to be a Presbyter, is advanced to an Office superior to what he formerly discharged ; so answerably, when a Presbyter is chosen to be a Bishop, he's advanced to a superior Office and Station to that he had when he was only a Presbyter. And *Blondel* himself owns, that *Clemens* speaks according to the use of the Church in his own time ; and if so, why not to that of the Apostles ? (Tho' *Blondel* has the Confidence, without assigning any reason, to deny it,) considering how near he lived to the time of the Apostles, and that he received his Instructions and Traditions from his great Master *Pantenus*, who had conversed with them who had seen the Apostles. * But this will more fully appear by what he says in his *Paedagogus*, l. 3. c. 12. near the End. Where having out of the Holy Scriptures, (chiefly *Rom.* 12. *Eph.* 4 and 5 *Ch.*) recommended several Christian Duties, he tells us, *That there are likewise in the Scriptures Duties prescribed to Persons, that were chosen to discharge particular Functions, αἱ μὲν πρεσβυτέρους, αἱ δὲ ἐπισκόποις, &c.* Some that appertained to Presbyters, some to Bishops, some to Deacons, others to Widows. Here this Father, who was so eminent a Teacher in the Church of *Alexandria*, not only mentions the several Offices of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, as then in use in the Church ; but as such in the times of the Apostles, being those to whom he supposes they enjoined particular Duties. For if the Apostles enjoined some Duties to *Bishops*, which were peculiar to them ; others to *Presbyters*, which were proper to their Station ; and so others to *Deacons*, to which they were peculiarly obliged : then 'tis evident, that *Clemens*

looked on these as distinct Offices in the times of the Apostles, and as such considered by them; and therefore as such Officers that derived their Authority from the Apostles; none else excepting their Master *Christ* having Power, but they to institute them. What shall we then think of *Blondel*, who tells us, that *Clemens pleno ore negabat*, fully and plainly denied that this Distinction of Offices was divinely instituted, p. 36. Let the Reader judge how little this Man's confident Assertions are to be heeded. And indeed what has been already cited out of this learned Father, is sufficient to shew what his Judgment was, and to interpret another Passage of his produced by *Blondel*, where he makes the Presbyters to have *βελτιωτικὴν εἰκόνα*, and the Deacons only *υπηρητικὴν*, these last an inferior Order and Ministry, and Presbyters a superior. 'Tis manifest, that when he had before expressly declared the three Offices of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon, to be distinct; he must here comprehend the two former under the Name of Presbyter, as distinct from Deacon; answerably to what is done in the Holy Scriptures, and other Authors, in respect to the Offices in the Jewish Church; where tho' the *High Priest* was a superior Office, and exercised peculiar Acts which *Priests* of the *Second Order* were incapable to perform; yet both Orders are express'd by the Title of *Priests* simply, and both are included in that Appellation as distinguished from *Levites*. But this I have handled in the *Preface*.

I might have herewith cited what the same *Clemens* saith in another Treatise, preserved by *Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23.* concerning St. *John's* ordaining Bishops in Churches neighbouring on *Ephesus*. But this I have before mentioned *Chap. 6.* In that place *Eusebins* tells out of the same Book of *Clemens*, a remarkable History of a young Man whom St. *John* had committed to the particular Care of a *Bishop*; which manifests there were Bishops in the time of that blessed Apostle. Neither is that Objection of any Validity

dity against this, because that Bishop is afterwards styled *πρεσβύτερος*, when the Word in that Place signifies no more than *πρεσβύτερος*, an old Man, which he is afterwards called, and has respect to his Age, and not his Office; and possibly was used to distinguish him from the young Man of whom he there speaks.

Another Person in the Church of *Alexandria*, eminent for great Learning, the famous *Origen*, attests the same thing that his Master *Clemens* had done before him, both that Bishops were in the Church, and that their Office was distinct from that of Presbyters; and with *Clemens* mentions the four Offices of *Widows*, *Deacons*, *Presbyters* and *Bishops*. This he doth in his Treatise of Prayer, where, pag. 103. in his Explication of that Petition of the Lord's Prayer, *Forgive us our Debts*, he mentions other Debts. "That there is *ὀφείλη*, a Debt of, or to the *Widow*, "another to the *Deacon*, another to the *Presbyter*, "and then that to the Bishop, that was weightiest "of all, which was by our Saviour required of the "whole Church, and that he'll punish them who neglect to pay it." Many other Testimonies to the same purpose might be cited out of *Origen*, which the Reader may find collected by the learned Bishop *Pearson* in his *Vindic. Ignat. Epist. Part I. c. II. p. 154, &c.* Out of which I shall only select one in his Comment on *St. Matthew*, in which he intimates, not only that the Church was then governed by Bishops, but also had been governed by them for some Generations, which must arise to the Times of the Apostles; when he blames such who valued themselves too much, because they descended from, or at least were educated by Bishops, or others of the Clergy. "There's a Necessity that we should depress the Opinion of them who esteem highly of themselves, because brought up under Parents professing Christianity; and especially if they are exalted on account of their Parents, or (*παρρηγοίς*) "Progenitors, who had attained to that Dignity in

132 *An History of the Government*

“ the Church to sit on the Bishop’s Throne, [*ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπισκοπικῆς θρόνου*] or to have “ the Honour of *Presbyters* or *Deacons* [to minister] “ to God’s People.” In which, as he makes these Offices distinct, the *Deacon* subordinate to the *Presbyter*, and the *Presbyter* to the *Bishop*, and the *Bishop* invested with the highest Authority, presiding on the Throne: So he supposes some to be the Offspring and Descendents of Bishops of some Generations then past, and consequently such as approached to, or at least were near the Times of the Apostles, he writing within 120 Years of the Time wherein St. John died.

From these Citations out of *Origen*, it appears of how little Service this Father is to the Presbyterians, when he mentions *Sacerdotes & Diaconos*, as comprehending all the Ministers of Christ; when under the first both Bishops and Presbyters are to be understood, and both Orders are frequently expressed in the ancient Fathers by *Sacerdotes*, and this as distinguishing from, and shewing their Eminency above Deacons. The Reason for which the Reader may find in the *Preface*.

Here it is not amiss to observe, that as the Church of *Alexandria* was under a Bishop, so his Jurisdiction was of a large Extent, and so far from being confined to a single Congregation, that it consisted of many Divisions, such as we now call Parishes, and that were, if not in *Origen*’s time, yet afterwards called *Laura*, who were under particular Presbyters: Which as it appears from many Arguments produced by ^f Bishop *Stillingsfleet*, and ^g Dr. *Maurice*; so likewise from the Numbers of *Origen*’s Auditors, ^h who were so many, one Company still succeeding another from Morning till Night; that he was forced to take in *Heraclas* for his Assistant in his Work,

^f *Unreasonableness of Separat.* Part 3. §. 10. ^g *Vindic. of the Primitive Church.* Ch. 1. §. 7 to 66.

^h *Euseb. H. E.* l. 6. c. 15.

to whom he committed the Instruction of young Beginners. Which shews the Vanity of them who confine a Bishop's Jurisdiction, and particularly that of *Alexandria*, to a single Congregation, when the Christians of that City were so vastly numerous, as to make many Congregations, yet all under one Bishop. This appears farther from what an eminent Bishop of that City, viz. *Dionysius*, who lived a little after *Origen's* time, (when *Valerianus* and *Gallienus*, were Emperors,) tells us, as *Eusebius* has preserved it, *H. E.* l. 7. c. 11.) how when he was, (in a time of Persecution under *Valerian*) banished to *Cophro*, that as the Christians did with the greater zeal assemble in the City of *Alexandria*, as if he had been present in body with them, so great multitudes resorted thither to him. But after he was removed to *Colluthio*, which was nearer the City, there were so many came to him thither, (as the Brethren had foretold him) that καὶ μέγας ἔσεν συναγωγὰι, there would be a necessity of several distinct Congregations: so he found it to fall out accordingly. So numerous were the Christians of that City even in a time of Persecution.

But besides the City, and its Suburbs and Precincts, we are told by *Athanasius* (*Apolog.* 2. p. 832.) that the Country of *Maraotes*, which was χώρα τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας, some distinct Division or Country of *Alexandria*, never had any Bishop in it, not so much as a *Chorepiscopus*, but was always subject to the Bishop of *Alexandria*; yet so, ⁱ that each Presbyter had his proper Village, which Villages were large, and in Number ten, or more. The like might be instanced of the ^k Village under the Bishop of *Caschara*, to which *Epiphanius* tells us *Manes* fled, which had its proper Presbyter, as the *Laura* in the City of *Alexandria*

ⁱ Ἐκαστος πρεσβυτέρων ἔχει τὰς ἰδίας κώμας, μεγάλας, καὶ ἀριθμῶ δέκα πᾶς καὶ πλείονας. ^k εἰς κώμῳ τινὰ τῆς χασ-
χάρων τῆς αὐτόθι πρεσβύτερος.

had. But this the aforementioned learned Authors have largely handled, to which I refer the Reader.

Here I might shew, that not only *Alexandria*, but also other Parts of *Egypt*, had their Bishops, and this before the time of *Heraclas*, notwithstanding the Dreams of *Eutychius*. This is evident from what *Eusebius* and *Pamphilus* related in their Apology for *Origen*, (as *Photius*, *Cod.* 118, has inform'd us, *) viz. "That *Demetrius* assembled a Synod of Bishops, "and of some Presbyters, against *Origen*:" And certainly these must be Bishops of *Egypt*. The Synod consisted of Bishops, but had some Presbyters present among them. Where *Blondel's* disingenuous perverting of Authors is observable, and justly taxed by Bishop *Pearson*; who in his *Addenda* to his Apology, bids his Reader take notice, that *Photius* tells us *Origenem Presbyterorum Decreto pulsum*. Whereas *Photius* makes it a Synod of Bishops, and therefore the Decrees must pass by their Authority, tho' some Presbyters were present among them, which only drove him from *Alexandria* and his Lecture, but meddled not with his Dignity as a Presbyter, and therefore probably was only a Diocesan Synod, in which Presbyters used to be present: For indeed it was a latter Synod that deprived *Origen*, as follows. "This *Demetrius* (ἀμα τισὶν ἐπισκόποις Αἰγυπτίοις) "together with some *Egyptian Bishops*, pronounced "him deprived of his Priesthood." Here as we find other Bishops of *Egypt* besides the Bishop of *Alexandria*, so there were many of them; as appears from *Origen's* own Complaint, in his Preface to his sixth Tome on *St. John*, where he complains of *Demetrius*, as one who raised (πάντας ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἀνέμυσ) all the Winds of *Egypt* against him, i. e. made all the Bishops of *Egypt* his Enemies; most probably when he had assembled them to condemn him in this latter Synod.

* *Phot. Cod.* 118. Σωὶδθ αἰρετίζε) ἐπισκόπων καὶ τινῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ Ὁριγύου.

That

That there were many Bishops in *Egypt*, appears from the Remains of *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria* (which are preserved by *Eusebius*;) who succeeded *Heracles*¹, in the third Year of the Emperor *Philippus*, *A. D.* 247. He mentions^m *Cheremon* Bishop of *Nilus*, who in a time of Persecution fled, together with his Wife, into a Mountain in *Arabia*. He mentions likewise Bishops to whom he wrote, ⁿ as *Conon* Bishop of *Hermopolis*, ^o *Germanus*, some Neighbour Bishop, but he tells us not of what See, ^p *Hierax*, whom he only calls a Bishop in *Egypt*, ^q *Ammon* Bishop of *Bernices*, ^r *Basilides* Bishop of *Pentapolis*: 'We find him likewise mentioning one *Nepos* a Bishop in *Egypt*, a Person endued with many commendable Qualities, but one that had entertained and vented some Errors, which had produced some ill Effects, and made a Schism in the Province of *Arfinoe*; of which Place therefore 'tis probable *Nepos* was Bishop; which Heterodoxies *Dionysius* confuted.

To evince the same thing, I might descend to lower Testimonies, as the Council of near an Hundred Bishops, which *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria* assembled to condemn *Arius*. But I shall only insist on the famous Council of *Nice*, which was assembled, as on that Account, so also to quell the Contests occasioned by the *Melitian* Hereticks. That Occasion fully intimates the Settlement of Bishops in other Churches of *Egypt*, as well as at *Alexandria*, as 'tis related by *Athanasius*, ^v *Socrates*, and ^x *Sozomen*. *Melitus* a Bishop in *Egypt* being convicted of many Crimes, particularly of sacrificing to Idols, was deposed by *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*, his Metropolitane in a Synod of Bishops. After which, instead of appealing to another Synod, (the only just Me-

¹ *V. Annal. Cyprian.*

ⁿ *Ibid. c. 46.*

^q *Ibid. c. 26.*

^r *Athanas. Apol. 2.*

^s *Sozom. l. 1. c. 24.*

^m *Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 42.*

^o *Id. l. 7. c. 11.*

^p *Ibid.*

^q *Ibid. c. 24.*

^r *Socrat. l. 1. c. 6.*

^v *Ibid. c. 21.*

136 *An History of the Government*

thod of Redress, if injured) he calumniates *Peter* and his Successors, makes a Schism, and took on him to ordain Bishops, and this within the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, and did consecrate near thirty Bishops, as appears by the List mentioned by *Athanasius*. For which *Melitus* himself was, by the Council of *Nice*, deposed, and deprived of Episcopal Power, having only the Name and Dignity of a Bishop left him; and those ordained by him censured, and made incapable of the sacred Office, unless in some Cases, and on some Conditions prescribed by the Council: Amongst whom there is one Instance worthy of our Consideration. There was one *Ischyra*s who pretended to be a Presbyter, because he was ordained as such by *Colluthus*. This *Athanasius* represents as monstrous, that he should esteem himself a Presbyter, who was ordained by one who was only a Presbyter, and died a Presbyter of the Church of *Alexandria*. Neither did *Ischyra*s plead that his Ordination was valid, as received from a Presbyter; for that was then an Opinion wholly strange to the Church, that a Presbyter had Authority to ordain a Presbyter; but he thought his Ordination good, because he received it from a Bishop, in that *Colluthus* had been ordained a Bishop by *Melitus* a Bishop, but then in an open Schism, in which *Colluthus* was involved: But this *Colluthus* afterwards renounced his Schism, and therewith his Orders, and was thereupon received into Communion as a Presbyter; and being no more, his Ordination of *Ischyra*s was judged invalid. If that Age rescinded Orders conferred against the Canon, because conferred by one who pretended to be a Bishop, but was in truth, according to the Canons of the Church, only a Presbyter; what Thoughts would they have entertained, and what Sentence would they have pronounced against Ordinations made by them, who were in truth and pretended to be no more, than mere Presbyters? In that Age this would

would have been esteemed a Prodigy ; especially, if acted in opposition to Bishops, and as against the Rules of the Catholick Church, so against the Constitutions of the particular National Church of which they are Members, and also against the Laws of the Kingdom of which they are Subjects : And besides all this, acting contrary to the Sentiments even of foreign neighbouring Churches, who are under Presbyterian Government.

But here I must take notice of what *D. Blondel* observes on this Sentence of the Council of *Nice*, for such it is, and not of *Osius*, as *Bl.* is pleased to call it, who was only President of that Synod. The Sum of what he says is this, “ That many things required by the Canons of the Church, have been “ dispensed with by the Church ; and so might this “ of *Colluthus*’s Ordination of *Ischyras*, had *Osius* “ pleased. Now here *Bl.* prevaricates, whilst he supposes that the only Reason of the Council’s annulling *Colluthus*’s Ordination, was the Violation of Ecclesiastical Canons ; when he might have known well enough, that it was founded on higher Reasons, viz. that the Power of Ordination was committed by Christ to the Apostles, and by them to the Bishops their Successors, and that none else, not Presbyters themselves, had any Authority to do it. And the Council and its President proceeded on this Reason, that, seeing *Colluthus* was only a Presbyter, he had no Power to ordain, tho’ he pretended to be a Bishop from his Orders received from *Melirius*, who had no Authority to confer them. This shews what was at that time, viz. of the first Christian Emperor, the received Doctrine of the Church, and its Practice pursuant thereto, that none had a Right to ordain, but Bishops, nor was any Ordination valid but what was conferred by them : And that the Council of *Nice* proceeded on this Reason, and not on a pre-

vious Determination or Canons of any former Council. And therefore if *Bl.* would have said any thing to the purpose, he should have shewn, either from *Scripture*, that this Power of Ordination was granted to mere Presbyters, or at least made it probable it was so by producing an Instance of a Presbyter ordaining; and if he had ordained, that it was not declared illegal and invalid. All his Instances of some Ordinations being disannulled because contrary to Canons, signifie nothing in this Case, where the Council proceeded on higher Reasons; nor the Ratifications of Ordinations given by Bishops in times of Schism. There is one Instance indeed which he gives us that has some Resemblance to the Case of *Colluthus*, that when some, who counterfeited themselves to be Bishops had ordained Persons in *Gallia Narbonensis*, Pope *Leo* declared that such Ordinations might *perseverare in Ecclesiis*. On the same Reason, saith *Bl.* that *Leo* did, might *Osius*. (He should have said the Council of which he was President) have proceeded in confirming the Ordinations of *Colluthus*.

To set this in a clear light, we must consider the Case here mentioned. It was about the Year 443 according to *Quesnell*, or later by several Years, as others compute it; and hence near 120 Years after the *Nicene* Council, which met *A. D.* 325. And as later, so only the Opinion of one Bishop of *Rome*, and therefore not of that Weight as the Decree of that first Venerable General Council. But omitting these Considerations I'll consider the Case it self. ² *Rusticus* Bishop of *Narbonne*, among many other Enquiries, consults *Leo* what should be done when a Presbyter or Deacon falsely pretended to be Bishops, and with those whom these ordained Clergymen. In this Enquiry is supposed that a Deacon might counterfeit himself a Bishop, and, as such, ordain. Now nei-

² *Leon. M. Epist. Quesn. 2. Al. 92.*

ther *Bl.* nor his Friends will allow this Power to Deacons ; consequently this reaches not their Case. Omitting that, I come to *Leo's* Answer, which follows ; *Nulla ratio finit, ut inter Episcopos habeantur, qui nec a Clericis sunt electi, nec a plebibus sunt expetiti, nec a Provincialibus Episcopis cum Metropolitanis judicio consecrati. Undè cum sæpè questio de malè accepto honore nascatur, quis ambigat, nequaquam istis esse tribuendum, quod non docetur fuisse collatum. Si qui autem Clerici ab istis Pseudo-Episcopis in eis Ecclesiis ordinati sunt, qui ad proprios Episcopos pertinebant, & ordinatio eorum consensu & judicio Presidentium facta est, potest rata haberi : ita ut in ipsis Ecclesiis perseverent. Aliter autem vana habenda est creatio [al. ordinatio] quæ nec loco fundata est, nec autore munita.*

“ No Reason permits that they should be accounted among Bishops, who were neither chosen by the Clergy, nor desired by the People, nor consecrated by the Provincial Bishops with the Approbation of the Metropolitan. When therefore there arises a Question concerning [that] Honour [as] not rightly received, who doubts, but that that is not to be granted to them, which was not shewn to be [indeed] conferred on them. But if there were any ordained Clergymen by these false Bishops, who belonged to their own Bishops, and their Ordination was made with the Consent and Approbation of the Presidents, it may be (he says not, *it shall be*) valid : So that *They* may continue in the Churches. Otherwise, the Creation is to be esteemed null, as having no ground [or place] on which it is founded, nor Author by whom it can be defended.

Here 'tis evident, at first view, that *Leo* looked on this as a generally acknowledged Truth, that none but Bishops had Authority to ordain. But, that we may fully understand his meaning, we must consider the importance of *Pseudo-Episcopi*. This may be gathered from the first Words of his Answer,

swer, which tells us whom he esteemed *true Bishops*, viz. *such as were chosen by the Clergy, desired by the People, and consecrated by the Comprovincial Bishops, with the Approbation of the Metropolitan.* This was that which the Custom of the Church, and its constant Practice, founded on the Decrees of the *Nicene Council*, made ordinarily requisite to constitute a truly Canonical Bishop. But when it often happened that all the Comprovincial Bishops could not be present at the Consecration of a Bishop, it was decreed there should be at least Three, who represented the Rest: Yet in several Councils in *France* near this time, as that of *Riez*^a, the first of *Orange*^b, and, not long before, the second of *Arles*^c, Complaints were made that some Bishops had been consecrated by One, others by only Two, on which they enacted, that at least Three Bishops should be present and join in the Consecration of a Bishop. Now 'tis probable, that such Bishops, who had not been thus canonically ordained (of whom Complaint was made) had ordained some *Clericos*, Presbyters, and this being an Office of the greatest Moment, as those who officiated at the Altar, and consecrated the Lord's Supper; *Rusticus* desires the Thoughts of *Leo* (a Person eminent for Wisdom, and a Bishop of that eminent Church of *Rome*) what reckoning he should make of these Presbyters ordained by such Bishops. *Leo* answers, that if their proper Bishops allow'd of them, and their Ordinations had been made, i. e. ratified, by the Consent and Allowance *Præsidentium*, i. e. of the Comprovincial Bishops and Metropolitan, they might be esteemed valid. This Answer supposes these Presbyters ordained by Bishops, but such who were not canonically consecrated, that is only by One, or at most Two Bishops, and probably without the Consent of the Metropolitan and his

^a *Concil. Régen. capit. 1.*^c *Concil. Arelat. II. can. 5.*^b *Concil. Araus. I. can. 21.*

Comprovincials. And now I leave the Reader to consider whether this Sentence of *Leo's*, shews that Presbyters have a Right to ordain, or is a Case parallel to that of *Colluthus*, as *Bl.* would make it; nay, whether in *both* 'tis not supposed as an acknowledged Truth, that none had a Right to ordain but Bishops, nor was any Ordination valid, but what was by the Imposition of their Hands.

But if this Sense of *Pseudoepiscopi* will not be allowed of, notwithstanding the Reasons alledged, it being an improper Expression to call those *counterfeit Bishops*, who wanted some Conditions, that were only required by the Canons of the Church; consequently, that hereby some must be understood, who falsely assumed this Character, and pretended to be Bishops, when in truth they were but Presbyters, and perhaps only Deacons: Then they must be wholly Strangers to the Persons among whom they came, and sincerely, tho' falsely, thought to be Bishops, by them who received Ordination from them. Now *Leo's* Judgment in this Case, is, that tho' these Men were not what they pretended to be, and acted contrary to the Laws of the Christian Church; yet if the *Præsidentes*, the Metropolitan and his Comprovincial Bishops, (considering that the Persons ordained thought their Ordainers to be really Bishops,) did allow and ratifie this Ordination, it might be judged valid, so as that these Persons might continue in the Church; the Consent and Approbation of these *Præsidents*, who had Authority to ordain, conferring on them a Right to act as Presbyters; being a postnate Act of the Church, confirming what was past, and what could not be undone.

That the Churches in *Egypt* and indeed all other Christian Churches were, at the time of the Council of *Nice*, governed by Bishops, appears from several Canons of that Council; but I shall only instance in the sixth Canon, *viz.* " Let ancient Customs (*ἀρχαία ἥθη*) prevail, which [have been observed] in
" *Egypt*

“ *Egypt and Libya and Pentapolis*, that the Bishop of
 “ *Alexandria* have [*Ἰεραία*] Authority over all
 “ these, forasmuch as the same hath been customa-
 “ ry with the Bishop of *Rome*. Accordingly also in
 “ *Antioch* and in other Provinces, let the Privileges
 “ be preserved to the Churches. But generally let
 “ this be certain, that if any one be made a Bishop
 “ without [the consent of] the Metropolitan, the
 “ great Council decrees such a one to be no Bishop.
 “ If two or three thro’ private Animosity oppose the
 “ common general Suffrage, which is reasonable,
 “ and according to the Ecclesiastical Canon [in the
 “ Election of a Bishop,] let the Vote of the Majori-
 “ ty determine it.” In this Canon made in a Gene-
 ral Council convened from so many parts of the
 World, not only out of the several Provinces of the
Roman Empire, but also out of *Persia* and *Scythia*
 (as is observed by *Eusebius*, *vit. Constantini* l. 3. c. 7.)
 and consequently, that which manifests the general
 Agreement of the Catholick Church at that time;
 we find Bishops universally established, and this con-
 sidered as ἀρχαῖον, an ancient Constitution: And
 not only the Government by Bishops but also a Sub-
 ordination of all Bishops in a Province under a Me-
 tropolitan, who had Authority to summon them to
 meet in Synods, and when met, to preside in those
 Synods. Besides a larger Jurisdiction allowed as cus-
 tomary to the Bishop of *Alexandria* over several
 Provinces, according as the Bishop of *Rome* had (as
 appears by *Rufinus*) over the Suburbicary Churches:
 (not, as the *Romanists* would persuade us, over the
 universal Church, when the Canon shews it was a
 limited Jurisdiction.) And all this not as a new Con-
 stitution of this Council, but as what was of ancient
 standing in the Church, to which the Council gives
 its Testimony: Besides the Regulation made in the
 Election of Bishops, that in Contests the Majority of
 Suffrages should carry it. Here I might have shewn
 from *Eusebius* (*vit. Constant.* l. 3. c. 8.) that this
 Council

Coun
 them
 accom
 learn
 ning
 that i
 the en
 Bel
 serve
Persia
 most
 Bp. St
 ch. 3.
 perfec
 as the
 sterly
 that v
 clude
 fally
 Christ
 and co
 preser
 of the
 sembla
 thia, i
 the wh
 men l.
 tho’ th
 Garisc
 ing all
 tropolis
 nefs o
 confine
 Her
 the Re
 cil, vi
 Years
Constan
 some E

Council consisted of *Bishops*, and that he distinguishes them from *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, and *Acoluthites*, who accompanied them; as I might the Sense of that learned Bishop, a Member of that Council, concerning the Government of the Church by Bishops. But that is reserved for the eleventh Chapter, towards the end thereof.

Before I leave this Council of *Nice*, I must observe that there were Bishops in that Assembly from *Persia* Easterly, and from *Scythia* Northerly, and most likely even from *Britain* (as the learned Bp. *Stillingfleet* has made probable, in his *Orig. Brit. ch. 3.* and would have clearly appeared, had we any perfect Subscriptions of that Council left us;) and as the famous *Osus* shews, there was from *Spain* Westerly; and we need not doubt of other Churches that were nearer to *Nice*. By which we may conclude that this Government by Bishops was universally settled in the Church in the time of the first Christian Emperor, under whom this Council met, and consequently before that time; of which more presently. Here I cannot omit the mention of one of these Bishops, who was present at that august Assembly, and that was *Vetranio* Bishop of *Tomi* in *Scythia*, in respect to the Extent of his Jurisdiction, viz. the whole Country of *Scythia*; in which, as *Sozomen l. 7. c. 15.* and more fully *l. 6. c. 21.* informs us, tho' there were many Cities, Villages, and (*περίεργα*) Garisons, yet there was but one Bishop; they being all subject to the Bishop of *Tomi*, the great *Metropolis*. This I observe, to shew the Unreasonableness of them who would unbishop Diocesans, and confine the Bishops Flock to a single Congregation.

Here I cannot pass by, without presenting it to the Readers consideration, a Canon of another Council, viz. that of *Arles*, which was held about eleven Years before that of *Nice*, under the same Emperor, *Constantine* the Great; (in which Council there were some *British* Bishops) and this, as it is transcribed out

144 *An History of the Government*

out of an ancient MS. of the Councils in the Library of Sarum, by the then Bp. of St. Asaph, now of Worcester, in his *Historical Account of the Antient Government of the Brittish Church*, Ch. 3. S. 3. It is the 18th Canon, *De Diaconibus Urbicis, ut non aliquid pro se ibi prasumant, sed honor Presbyteris reservetur, & Presbyteri sine conscientia Episcopi nihil faciant.* "For the
 " Deacons of the City [Rome] that they take not
 " upon them there upon their own Account, but
 " that Honour be reserved to the Presbyters. And
 " that the Presbyter do nothing without the leave
 " of the Bishop." This Canon not only shews that Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons were distinct Offices, but also the Subordination of the Deacons to the Presbyters, and of the Presbyters to the Bishops to whom they were to be in Subjection, the Bishops being made the Fountain of Authority in their Churches. And this shews what was the received Sense both of the Bishops assembled in that Council, and likewise of the Churches which sent them thither: And the more to be considered (as that learned Prelate observes) because it was immediately after the tenth Persecution, and therefore before there could be any of these Temptations of secular Greatness and Wealth, which are said to have caused the Corruptions that altered the Primitive Purity of Ecclesiastical Government. So that whatsoever was then in the Church, we have Reason to believe, had continued from the first Constitution, especially in things universally received in all parts of the Church. The same will hold in respect to the Council of Nice, and what I have produced from it.

I cannot in this place forbear to mention the Testimony of one eminent Person of this time, viz. the great *Athanasius*, the mighty Champion of the Orthodox Doctrine against the Heresy of the *Arians*; chiefly because he was Bishop of *Alexandria*, (tho' of an inferior Order at the Council of Nice) the Government of which Church I have been considering.

When his Friend *Dracontius*, an Ascetick, tho' chosen to be a Bishop, declined it; that great Man in an Epistle argues the Case with him, telling him " that by his refusing to be a Bishop, as he gave a " Scandal to others, &c. so also he made himself a " Contemner of our Saviour, who had instituted " that Office. For whatever the Lord appointed, " by the Apostles, that continues right and firm, [i. e. as the Institution of Christ himself.] And after adds, " If all Men had been of your Mind, how " would you have been made a Christian, when " there were no Bishops? And if after us others " should take up the same Resolution, how should " the Churches subsist?" In which Words he clearly asserts the Necessity of Bishops to the Continuance of the Church of Christ, and also to the Continuance of Christianity it self; as well as he makes the Institution of that Order to be by the Apostles; and consequently, if by them, then by Christ himself, when they acted by his Direction. This cannot with any ground be evaded by making *Athanasius* to speak only of *Dracontius*'s averfness to enter on the Priesthood or Clerical Office in general; when 'tis evident from other Places of his Works, how careful he is in distinguishing Bishops and Presbyters: As in his first Apology, where in defending his own Departure from *Alexandria*, his own Flock, for which the *Arians* reproached him; he upbraids them with their Persecutions, and in recounting what Violences they were guilty of, he shews how they had forced away many Bishops, as *Ammonius*,

^a Ep. Athanas. ad Dracont. Tom. i. p. 955. Ed. Paris. Καλαφρονεῖν τὰ ταῦτα διαταξαμένης Σωτῆρος τοῦ ποιήσαντος σαυτόν.—
" Ἄ γὰρ ὁ κύριος διὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων τέλει πωκε, ταῦτα καλὰ καὶ βέλ-
βαια μένει.—Εἰ τὸ αὐτὸν νῦν ἔχον πάντες, οἷον νῦν ἔχουσιν συμ-
βουλόνοίς σοι, πῶς ἂν ἐγένετο σὺ χειριστὴς, ἐπισκόπων μὴ ὄν-
των; εἰ δὲ καὶ οἱ μετ' ἡμᾶς ἀναλάβωσι τὸ τοιοῦτον νῦν πῶς ἂν
συστήναι δυνήσαντο αἱ Ἐκκλησίαι;

146 *An History of the Government*

Thamus, and others whom he there names ; so also *Hierax* and *Dioscorus*, who were *Presbyters*, where he plainly distinguishes those Offices: He afterwards mentions the Enmity which the *Arians* expressed against the Bishops of *Spain*, *France*, *Egypt* and *Africa*, who had any Kindness for himself. From which 'tis plain that the Churches in all those Nations were in his Time governed by Bishops. In his second Apology, he mentions several Councils of Bishops, (who asserted his Innocency and the Justice of his Cause,) and some of them out of many Nations ; particularly that of *Sardica*, which consisted of above three Hundred Bishops. But these things are too manifest to be insisted on. And pag. 765. he shews how his Enemies not only received *Arians* into their Communion, but also advanced them to higher Offices in the Church ; raising some from *Deacons* to be *Presbyters*, and others from *Presbyters* to be *Bishops*: Where he clearly distinguishes, and shews the Gradation of these Offices. Near the End of his Epistle to *Dracontius*, he distinguishes the Offices, and tells him he had sent *Hierax* his *Presbyter* to invite and persuade him to take on him the Office of a *Bishop*, which he had hitherto declined. From which 'tis evident, that what he said in his Epistle to *Dracontius*, of the Divine Institution of Bishops, and the Necessity of these to the Being of a Church, must be understood of *Bishops* in the commonly received Sense, *i. e.* as a superior Order to that of *Presbyters*.

C H A P.

Bish

H

Afcer
prian?
that a
and a
in N
shops
to all
owne
the da
Cartha
we fin
shops,
the ac
before
cident
therefo
before
becaus
uncon
before
them.
come t
very n
pion a
Tertull
him, t
Presby
pear p
of Car

C H A P. X.

Bishops at Carthage and the adjoining Territory.

HOW considerable the Church of *Carthage* was a little above two hundred Years after Christ's Ascension, is manifest to every one that reads *S. Cyprian's* Works, and other Monuments of Antiquity that accompany them; and withal, that that Church and all those in *Africa*, strictly so called, as also those in *Numidia* and *Mauritania*, were governed by Bishops, and these superior to Presbyters, is evident to all unprejudiced Readers. And yet it must be owned, that in Times preceding that, we are in the dark, both in respect to that famous Church of *Carthage*, as well as those others neighbouring on it; we finding but only the Names of two or three Bishops, who are occasionally mentioned, till that of the admirable *S. Cyprian*. And no wonder, when before that time, we have but little, and that an accidental Mention of any Church in that City. And therefore for any to say, there were no Bishops there before that, or however a little before *S. Cyprian*, because we have no History of them; would be as unconclusive, as to say there were no Christians there before that, because we have so little Account of them. 'Tis true, that not long before that, we come to know that there were Christians, and these very numerous, in that City, from a zealous Champion and strenuous Apologist for them, the acute *Tertullian*. But then withal, we are assured from him, that there were Bishops, and these superior to Presbyters who presided in Churches, (as will appear presently;) and thence no doubt in this Church of *Carthage*, of which he was not only a Member,

148 *An History of the Government*

but most probably a Presbyter. This learned Father not only speaks of Christians at *Carthage*, but speaks of them as very numerous, and hence making a considerable Church, but affords no light concerning its Founder. We may indeed conclude from him, that it was not founded by any of the Apostles, in that he would not have omitted this, when he reckons up those Churches, which he styles *Matrices*, such which had their immediate Original from the Apostles, that were the Mothers of other Churches, from which those Churches received their Stamp, and derived their Original: I say, 'tis not to be imagined that when in his *Prescriptions* he reckons up those Churches, had *Carthage*, in which he ministred, been one of them, but that he would have put it into that Number. It must therefore be planted from some Neighbour Church; most probably from that of *Rome*, whose Zeal for promoting Religion in those times was as eminent as was afterwards their Ambition for Superiority, of which 'tis wished that the Christian World had no just Ground to complain. This may probably be gathered from what *Tertullian* says, *Prascript. c. 36. Romam, unde nobis quoque Authoritas praesto est.* But whoever founded the Church of *Carthage*, 'tis evident, that it was of singular Note in *Tertullian's* time, as well as afterwards, in that, whilst he dissuades *Scapula*, who was President of that Province of which *Carthage* was the head City, from persecuting the Christians; he tells him how quietly and peaceably they behaved themselves, tho' so numerous, tho' the major part of their Cities, S. 2. And then more fully, S. 5. He asks him, " If the Christians should offer themselves before his Tribunal, as some did in *Asia* to *Arrius Antoninus*, what he would do to so many Thousands, so many Men, so many Women, Persons of every Sex, Age and Dignity? What plenty of Fires and Swords he would stand in need of? He bids him consider, if *Car-*
thage

“ *thage* [that is the Christians thereof] were to
 “ suffer by Decimation only, what Numbers each
 “ Person, nay even himself, would see of his Neigh-
 “ bours and dearest Friends among them.” This
 manifests the multitude of Christians at that time at
Carthage, and consequently the Greatness of that
 Church. Now tho’ *Tertullian* gives us not the Name
 of any Bishop of that Church, having no occasion
 for it; yet we have Reason from him to conclude
 that that Church was then governed by *Bishops*,
 when he speaks of that Office as generally received
 in all Churches, asserts their Authority, speaks of
 them as a distinct Office from Presbyters, and supe-
 rior to them, and this in many Places of his Works.
 I omit here his giving us the Succession of Bi-
 shops in some Churches even from the Apostles
 themselves, in his *Prescriptions*, c. 32. and against
Marcion, l. 4. c. 5. having recited these already, *ch.* 7.
 In which he supposes this Government universally
 settled. Omitting to repeat those Testimonies, we
 find him frequently mentioning *Bishop*, *Presbyter*
 and *Deacon* as distinct Offices, as *Prescript.* c. 41. So
 also in his Book against *flying in time of Persecution*,
 c. 11. He questions how Laicks should understand
 Christ’s Words of flying from one City to another,
quum ipsi Auctores, id est, ipsi Diaconi, Presbyteri &
Episcopi fugiunt? “ When they who were in Autho-
 “ rity [in the Church] that is, *Deacons, Presbyters*
 “ *and Bishops* fled.” There’s the like Enumeration
 of these three Orders in his Book *de Monomachia*, c. 11.
 But omitting this, I’ll observe a Passage of his,
 which is in his Treatise *de Baptismo* c. 17. wherein
 he not only reckons up these three distinct Offices,
 but also asserts the *Bishops* Authority as superiour to
 that of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. *Dandi quidem [bap-*
tismum] habet jus summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus;
dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi
auctoritate, propter Ecclesie honorem. The chief Priest,
 who is the Bishop, hath the right of administering Bap-

tism, [or, the original Power is lodged in the Bishop] and after, [or, from thence] *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, but not without the *Bishops Authority* [or *Commission*] for the Churches Honor, i. e. to secure the Reputation of the supreme Government established in the Church, and thereby that of the Church it self. In this Testimony we find *Tertullian* ascribing the highest Office of the Christian Priesthood to the Bishop, making *Presbyters* and *Deacons* subordinate to him; and so far asserting the Power of exercising the Functions in the Church to be in the Bishop, that he affirms, that even that of Baptism could not be regularly exercised by the inferior Orders of *Presbyters* and *Deacons* without his Leave or Commission. In his Book *de Jejun.* c. 13. he gives the Power of appointing publick Fasts to the Bishop. All which, as also the Citations from him, Ch. 8. not only shew what was *Tertullian's* Opinion, but what the Government and Practice of the Christian Church was in his Time, and who were Officers of the Church, viz. Bishops, who had the highest Authority, and under them *Presbyters* and *Deacons*; and consequently, what the Government was in the Church of *Carthage*, of which he was a Member.

'Tis acknowledged, that *Tertullian* in his *Præscript.* c. 41. speaks of some who confounded these Orders in the Church, that were one Day *Bishops*, the next Day somewhat else; one Day *Deacons*, the next *Lectors*; one Day *Presbyters*, the next *Laicks*. But then he brands these as Rebels, and reckons them among Hereticks, and of that sort who imitated Heathens in the Mysteries of their Religion, and feigned another God besides the Creator of the Universe, and taught other absurd and impious Doctrines: As appears by what he tells us of these Men, both before and after the forecited Passage. And hereby he intimates what Thoughts he and other Christians had, and ought to have, of the distinct Orders in the Church.

'Tis

'Tis true, *Tertullian* names not any of the Bishops of *Carthage*, having no occasion to mention them; yet we have the Name of one of them, viz. *Optatus*, in the Acts of *Perpetua* and *Felicitas* (which probably might be written by *Tertullian*) in whose time those Martyrs suffered. This *Optatus* in those Acts (pag. 24. Ed. Oxon.) is mentioned as the Person to whom those holy Martyrs owed the greatest Reverence and Subjection, and who is by them styled *Papa noster*, a Name then given ^a to every Bishop, (at least to all Metropolitans) who are in a peculiar manner our Spiritual Fathers; as is clear (not to name other Instances) by *S. Cyprian's* being frequently so styled, and that by the Clergy of *Rome*, *Epist.* 30. and 36. Tho' 'tis since usurped by the Bishops of *Rome* as their proper and peculiar Title. We find this *Optatus* spoken of as distinct from his Presbyter *Aspasius*, who is expressly styled a *Presbyter*, a Word then appropriated to that Order in the Church. In the Vision, ^b wherein these two were represented to the holy Martyr *Saturnus* as sad and at a distance from each other; or the Angels said to them, "what Differences there are between you, compose them; and then chid them, and said, *Optatus*, correct thy People, in that they come before thee, like Persons returning from the *Circus* [the Place of Combates] (in a tumultuous Way) contending for Factions." Where as we find in this Vision, vouchsafed to these holy Martyrs, the Angels reproving those Persons for their Dissensions; so they command *Optatus*, to whom the Government of the Church was committed, being the Bishop thereof, to exert his Authority, in chastising the People

^a *V. Pearsoni Vind. Ignat. P. I. c. 10. pag. 181, 182.*

^b *Act. Perpet. & Felicit. Si quas habetis inter vos dissensiones, dimittite vobis invicem. Et conturbaverunt eos, & dixerunt; Op- tate, corrige plebem tuam; quia sic ad te conveniunt, quasi de Circo redeuntes, & de factionibus certantes.*

152 *An History of the Government*

committed to his Charge, and in making use of the spiritual Weapons of Discipline. This Injunction was given to *Optatus* the Bishop, and not to *Aspasius* the Presbyter: which shews this an acknowledged Truth, that the Right of governing the Church, and the Administration of Discipline resided in the Bishop, who was not only of a distinct, but also of a superior Order to that of a Presbyter. When the excellent Bishop *Fell* (induced by the Sight of some MS.) supposed that this *Optatus* was Bishop of *Tuburbis*, it would be Presumption in me to determine him to be Bp. of *Carthage*. But this latter is most probable, in that he was Bishop of that Church, of which these holy Martyrs *Perpetua* and *Felicitas* were Members, by whom he is styled *Papa noster*, our Father; when 'tis probable they were martyred at *Carthage*, when it was the Place of their Abode; when it is clear, that they were exposed to wild Beasts at a great Solemnity, ' the Birth-day of *Geta Caesar*; and thence that it was acted at *Carthage*, the chief City of *Africa*, the *Proconsul's* Residence^a, whom we find mention'd as lately dead, and the *Procurator*, having then the Power of the Sword presiding at that barbarous Spectacle, or at least adjudged these blessed Martyrs to be Objects thereof, who most probably, at least in this Interval, resided at *Carthage*.

As we have here the Name of *Optatus*, so we have in *S. Cyprian's* Epistles (*Epist.* 71. and 73. *Ed. Oxon.*) that of *Agrippinus*, as *S. Cyprian's* Predecessor, and one who presided in a Council, which was assembled about the Rebaptization of Hereticks. But how long before *S. Cyprian*, we have no certain *Criterion* (so far as I can find) to direct us. On-

^a *Aët. Perpet. & Felicit. p. 16. (Ed. Oxon.) Munere Castrensi eramus pugnaturi natali tunc Getæ Cæsaris.*

^d *Ibid. p. 12. Hilarianus Procurator, qui tunc loco Proconsulis Minucii Timiani defuncti jus gladii acceperat.*

ly * *Multi jam anni sunt, & longa etas ex quo sub Agrippino, &c.* that it was a long time since that Council was held under *Agrippinus*. The learned Bishop *Fell* observes upon that Passage, that it must be before the Rise of the *Montanists*, that is the Year *Two Hundred*; otherwise *St. Augustin* would not have omitted the mention of it, which might have been serviceable to him in that Cause which he had so heartily espoused.

* We have likewise in *St. Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Cornelius*, (n. 69.) mention of *Fabianus* and *Donatus*, as his Predecessors. As for *Fabianus*, 'tis most likely to be understood of him who was the Predecessor of *Cornelius*, at *Rome*. In which tho' learned Men are not agreed; yet by all 'tis concluded, that *Donatus* was *S. Cyprian's*, and most probably his immediate Predecessor.

But omitting those former, of whom we have very little besides their Names, I shall insist upon that justly renowned Bishop of *Carthage*, *S. Cyprian*; because from his Writings, especially his Epistles, we may understand very much not only of the State of the Church of *Carthage* and its Government, and of others in *Africa*, but also of many others in the Christian World: There being frequent Occasion to mention them, as they consulted this excellent Bishop of *Carthage* on Emergencies, maintained a Correspondence with him by communicatory Letters, met with him in Synods to advise about the Affairs of the Church, and on other Occasions. Now if we can find that the Churches of *Africa* were governed by Bishops, that is, Officers distinct from, and superior to Presbyters; and these Churches of a greater Extent, than of a single Congregation: This might prevail with Dissenters to comply with this Government; when *Mr. Baxter*, (with whom many other Dissenters concur in this his Sentiment) esteemed these *African*

154 *An History of the Government*

as the best ordered Churches in the World. Abundant Testimonies might be produced out of this holy Martyr's Works on this Subject, but a few will be sufficient, if not to convince our Adversaries (which I pray God may be effected,) yet to leave them inexcusable.

But before I proceed to this, I must consider one thing, which only concerns the Person of St. Cyprian himself, viz. that Passage of *Pontius* in St. Cyprian's Life, from which *Blondel* p. 45. would infer, that according to *Pontius*, a Bishop and a Presbyter are the same. That when he declares how without delay, *Cyprian*, from an Heathen, not merely as the Eunuch *Acts* 8. from a Jew, embraced Christianity; he tells how likewise when called thereto, he entred on the Offices of the sacred Ministry of both Orders. *Mora circa gratiam Dei nulla, nulla dilatio. Parum dixi: Presbyterium & Sacerdotium statim accepit.* "There was no delay " in his acceptance of God's Grace. I have [in " this] said little: He presently [or with all readiness] accepted the Presbyterate, and the Sacerdotal Office." Now as we must hereby understand, not that from his Baptism he was immediately ordained to a sacred Office, for he was for some time a *Laic*, as is evident from what *Pontius* says, *Multa sunt quæ adhuc plebeius fecit*, that he did many things whilst he remained in that Lay Station; and after that a Presbyter, in which he did many things; so afterwards he was advanced to the higher Degree of Priesthood, viz. that of a Bishop. For that by *Sacerdotium* this is to be understood, not only in that St. Cyprian most frequently calls Bishops by the Word *Sacerdotes*, and so the word is proper to express that Office, but as this Place requires it to be taken in this Sense, when he immediately adds, *Quis enim non omnes honorum gradus crederet tali mente credenti?* "For who would " not commit to such a one all the Degrees of Honour?" By which as he intimates several Degrees of Honour, and Dignity, several Offices in the Church,

so

so he shews *Cyprian* was worthy of them, and had them conferred on him; the first of which was that of a Presbyter, the other, which followed, and which was yet higher, that of a Bishop. And that he had both these Offices, *St. Jerom* in his *Catalogue* testifies. *Post non multum temporis electus in Presbyterum, etiam Episcopus Carthaginiensis constitutus est.* "After a little time he was chosen a Presbyter, and after Bishop of Carthage." The same thing *Eusebius* tells us in his *Chronicon*. By all which as *Blondel's* foregoing Inference is evidently groundless, so is that which he says, p. 207. *Cyprianus ad Episcopatus gradum adhuc Neophytus electus est*, as if he afore he was baptized, or however immediately after, was consecrated a Bishop. By which the Reader has a farther Specimen of *Blondel's* groundless Assertions, and how little reason he has to depend on them, tho' ever so confidently delivered.

But leaving this Digression, I return to what I propounded, viz. to shew what Evidence there is for Episcopacy in the Writings of *St. Cyprian*.

First, We find that when he enumerates the Ministers of Christ in particular Churches, he mentions the Bishop, the Presbyters and the Deacons, and these as distinct Offices. Thus (*Epist.* 48.) he tells *Cornelius* Bishop of Rome, who took some Exceptions at the Carriage of the Church of *Adrumetum* towards him; that the Presbyters and Deacons of that Church, their Bishop, his Colleague, *Polycarp* being absent, were ignorant what had been decreed by other Churches of *Afric* in acknowledging *Cornelius* as duly elected Bishop of Rome: Where each Office of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon in the same Church is enumerated, and the Bishop spoken of as his Colleague. We find *St. Cyprian*, as asserting himself to be true Bishop of Carthage (in opposition to those that had made a Schism in the Church) in that he was duly substituted in the room of his deceased Predecessor, chosen peaceably by the Suffrage of the People, approved of

156 *An History of the Government*

of God, who had protected him in time of Persecution, and firmly united to other Bishops, his Collegues, &c. *Epist.* 59. So we find him frequently writing to his Presbyters, as with a Spirit of Christian Meekness, so, as their Superior, with an Air of Authority, suitable to his Office, *Epist.* 26, 34, 38, 39, 40. As likewise he doth to the Presbyters and Deacons of the Church of *Rome*, after the Death of their Bishop, *Ep.* 27, 35. So also do the Presbyters and Deacons of that Church write to *St. Cyprian*, and express their Inability of themselves, they wanting a Bishop to settle Affairs: And that the Difficulties they then conflicted with, hindred them from chusing a Bishop into the Place of *Fabianus*, who had been for some time dead, *Ep.* 30, 36. Besides, other Passages might be mentioned, that when he has occasion to speak of Christ's Ministers, as *Epist.* 76. he expressly distinguishes the Bishops from the Presbyters and Deacons. *Cyprian* to *Nemesianus*, *Felix*, &c. my Fellow-Bishops, also to my Fellow-Presbyters and Deacons, &c. So ¹ *Cornelius* who was at this time Bishop of *Rome*, tells *Fabius* Bishop of *Antioch*, that there were in his time in *Rome* 46 Presbyters and 7 Deacons. And that *Cornelius*, (and answerably the Bishop in other Churches) was Superiour to all other Officers, and particularly Presbyters, is evident from the Account which ² *St. Cyprian* gives *Antonianus* of *Cornelius*, that he did not rise on a sudden to the Episcopate, but was promoted thro' all other Ecclesiastical Offices, by all the steps of Religion to that sublime Eminency of Priesthood. And indeed, had there been no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter, what need had there been of his being made a Bishop, or consecrated by 16 other Bishops, *St. Cyprian's* Collegues, who were at that time at *Rome*? What need in order hereto, was there of the Clergy's Testimonies, and the People's Suffrage or Approba-

¹ *Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 43.*

² *Cypr. Epist. 55.*

tion,

tion
evi
Jud
Fa
be v
byt
one
in t
ano
to f
a Pr
he
mac
he c
find
by
othe
prian
him
fund
peac
Nov
self
whic
neces
tain
Prac
Bish
of m
to o
this v
mari
disti
The
tunat

^b E
Ep. 59
positum
oil w

tion, and other things mentioned by St. Cyprian, to evidence that he was promoted to that Office by the Judgment of God and Christ? In a word, how came Fabianus's place, into which Cornelius succeeded, to be vacant, if he was no more than an ordinary Presbyter; and whence so great a Care used to elect one who might be fit to succeed him? 'Tis evident in this Age, that when any Bishop died, there was another not only elected, but also formally ordained to succeed him. It was not enough that Cornelius was a Presbyter, to qualifie him to succeed Flavianus, but he must be chosen and consecrated a Bishop. He made his Advances thro' all Ecclesiastical Offices, till he came to the highest step, that of a Bishop. We find *Epist.* 56. that the Bishop of *Capsa* was ordained by *Fortunatus*, *Ahimnius*, *Optatus*, *Privatianus*, and other Bishops, who met there for that End. St. Cyprian forced by the Schism of *Fortunatus*, speaks of himself *Epist.* 59. as substituted a Bishop *in locum defuncti*, in the room of one that was dead, and chosen peaceably by the universal Suffrage of the People. *Novatian* ^b when he had the Ambition to set up himself Bishop of *Rome*, he, tho' before a Presbyter (to which Office he arrived with difficulty) knowing the necessity of being ordained a Bishop, in order to attain his Design, according to the universally received Practice of the Church, prevailed with three simple Bishops, (whom he had got to *Rome*, under pretence of making them Reconcilers of some differences there) to ordain him to that Office: Which manifests that this was a received Truth by all Persons, even Schismatick's themselves, that the Office of a Bishop was distinct from, and superior to that of a Presbyter. The same might be shewn from the Schismatick *Fortunatus*, ⁱ the Rival of St. Cyprian, his procuring

^b *Ep. Cornel. ad Fab. Antioch. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 43.* ⁱ *Cypr. Ep. 59. Ep. 66. — Nec Fraternitas habuerit Episcopum, nec Plebs Propositum, nec Grex Pastorem, nec Ecclesia Gubernatorem, &c.*

158 *An History of the Government*

himself to be ordained by five profligate Bishops, who had been condemned by the Church for their Heresies, Apostasies, or other Crimes; without which Ordination (such as it was) he could not have had any pretence to set up for Bishop of *Carthage*. If Presbyters were the same with a Bishop, and invested with the same Authority, how unreasonably did St. *Cyprian* argue with *Pupianus*, who question'd his Authority; that if his Objections had been valid, "then for six Years the Brotherhood had had no Bishop, nor the People a President, nor the Flock a Pastor, nor the Church a Governour, &c. How could this have been true, tho' *Cyprian* had been no true or worthy Bishop of that Church, when the Church of *Carthage* had all that time Presbyters in it? No, he alone, and not the Presbyters, was the Bishop, President and Governour thereof; and this is the Foundation of St. *Cyprian's* Reasoning. And to name no more, even the Heathens themselves observed *Cyprian's* Preeminence in that Church, and this of Bishop as the superior Office; when (as he observes in the same Epistle) they proscribed him as Bishop of the *Christians*, and thence one in the most eminent Station in the Church.

Secondly, it appears that then this Distinction of Offices was not only in some eminent Churches, as in those of *Rome* and *Carthage*, but throughout the whole World. * *Episcopos in Ecclesiis Dominicis in TOTO MUNDO divinâ dignatione prepositos*. There in a particular Case he urges the Example of "Bishops who presided in the Churches of Christ thro' the whole World, placed there by the Favour of Almighty God." And more fully *Epist. 55.* that there were not only at the time of his writing, but *jampridem*, formerly Bishops, and those pious and orthodox ordained in each Province and City: And from thence he argues, that their Guilt was great,

* *Epist. 63.*

who

who
them
Th
was
versa
as the
" ou
" tha
" Bi
" un
Fou
Bisho
Distr
cons,
him,
it was
" Ch
" Pec
" of
it) St
been
six Ye
one in
that a
that C
or He
follow
Believ
" Hop
" tism
" that
" Han
" Pen
" and
had,
made
(ordin

who schismatically set up others in opposition to them. In which places likewise he asserts,

Thirdly, That there was no Christian Church that was not under a Bishop; and that Bishops were universally placed in all Provinces and Cities; "That as there was one Church, so one Episcopate throughout the whole World, diffused in proportion to that one Church, *Episcoporum numerositate*, in the Bishops, who tho' many in Number, yet were united in their harmonious Concord.

Fourthly, From St. Cyprian, 'tis evident, that the Bishop was the supreme Church-Officer in his own District, so that Clergy, both Presbyters and Deacons, as well as *Plebs*, the Laity were subject to him, and under his Guidance and Government. He it was ¹ " *Qui Ecclesie præst*, who was set over the Church, who was *præpositus*, the Rector of the People, the Pastor of the Flock, the Governour of the Church, &c. For (as I have already cited it) St. Cyprian argues with *Pupianus*, that if he had been no true Bishop, the Church of *Carthage* had for six Years, *viz.* from the time he was elected, wanted one invested with this Authority, and by consequence, that all that time (tho' there were then Presbyters in that Church,) there had been no Regular Governor or Head of that Church: "And then, (as it there follows,) "all that time much People of the new Believers might have gone out of the World without Hope of Salvation, they might have wanted Baptism, and the Grace of the Holy Spirit [*viz.* that conferred by the Imposition of the Bishops Hands, that we now call Confirmation.] And the Penitent lapsed Persons would have wanted Peace and Reconciliation." Tho' this excellent Bishop had, from his Entrance on his Episcopal Office, made this a Law to himself, that he would not (ordinarily) act any thing of Moment without the

¹ *Epist. 66.*

the Advice of his Presbyters, and the Consent of his People; yet he frequently asserts his Authority as *Supreme* in his Church of *Carthage*, and appropriates several Acts of Government to himself as Bishop, which ought not to be performed but by himself, or by his Commission. Such was that of absolving Penitents, and reconciling them to the Church who had lapsed in times of Persecution, as he shews in *Epist.* 15, 16, 17. For, when some of these had, by the Intercession of Martyrs, been received into Communion (when they had not continued in the State of Penitents, according to the Custom or Canons of the Church) by some of his Presbyters; *St. Cyprian* upon his being acquainted therewith, in his Retirement, in a time of Persecution, warmly expostulates with the Martyrs, who had transcended their Bounds; but especially with the Presbyters, as on other Reasons, so on this, that thereby they usurped on the Bishop's Jurisdiction, *Epist.* 16. "Who being not mindful of the Gospel, nor of his Place [or Office] nor considering God's future Judgment, or the Bishop who was set over them, contrary to what was practised in the time of his Predecessors, had with the Contempt *Propositi*, of the Bishop, challenged the whole of this to themselves. And so *Epist.* 17. that without reserving to the Bishop (*honorem sacerdotii & cathedra*) the Dignity belonging to his Priesthood and Throne, they had communicated with the *Lapsi*, &c." why should this holy Martyr have argued thus, if he, as a Bishop had not been invested with Authority superiour to that of a Presbyter? Another Act of Power peculiar to the Bishop, was the inflicting Church-Censures and excommunicating Offenders; concerning which I shall produce one Instance in the Church of *Carthage*, out of *Epist.* 41. When *Felicissimus* and his Partisans had made a Schism, and embroiled the Church; *S. Cyprian* being in his Retirement, and hereby uncapable

ble
Nei
who
self
thol
ing
own
rity
the
pria
pres
fulti
the
orda
an A
doim
was
cont
him
cou
form
nity
priv
Fa
even
cou
matio
neces
St. Cy
have
red A
his H
4 oth
for H
dain
how
Cice

ble to do it in his own Person, deputed two of his Neighbour Bishops, *Caldonius* and *Herculanus*, with whom he joins two of his Presbyters, who of themselves had no Authority to do it, to excommunicate those Schismatics. What need was there of employing those Bishops in that Act of Discipline, had his own Presbyters had of themselves sufficient Authority to do it? Another Act, which is peculiar to the Bishop, is that of Ordination. Now this *S. Cyprian* performed, (notwithstanding the Rules he had prescribed to himself of doing nothing without consulting his Presbyters and People) in his Retirement, the Presbyters being incapacitated to do it, when he ordained *Anrelius* and *Celerinus*; of which he gives an Account, *Epist.* 38, 39. and the Reasons of his doing it. Could the Presbyters have done it, there was no Reason that *S. Cyprian* should have done it, contrary to the Custom and the Rules he had set himself; and especially, when if the Presbyters could have ordained, the Office might have been performed before the Church, and with greater Solemnity than it could be done by this holy Bishop in his private Retirement.

Farther, it was then acknowledged by all Persons, even by Schismatics themselves, that a Church could not subsist without a Bishop; when the Schismatics who had revolted from *St. Cyprian*,^m saw it necessary to make *Fortunatus* their Bishop, whom *St. Cyprian*, calls *Pseudo-Episcopum*; and withal to have him ordained by a Bishop: Hence they procured *Privatus*, a Bishop who had been condemned for his Heresies and other Crimes, by 90 Bishops, and 4 other Bishops, who had been deposed and censured for Heresy, Apostasy, or the like Offences, to ordain this *Fortunatus* an *Anti-Bishop*; being sensible how requisite it was, according to the constant Practice of the Church, to have a Bishop to head them

^m *Epist.* 54.

in this their rebellious Schism; and withal, how necessary it was to have Bishops, tho' Profligates, to ordain him to that Office. The same we find owned by Hereticks, whom St. Cyprian mentions *Epist. 72. A Pseudo-Episcopis profana ordinatione promoti sunt*; that their Clergy was ordained by Bishops, but such, who being out of the Church, falsely assumed that Name and Authority. I might have here taken notice of the Bishops that were met at *Capsa* to ordain a Bishop there, to whom St. Cyprian wrote *Epist. 96.* But that has been mentioned; and I need not insist on it. Here's enough to shew, that at this time it was a thing universally acknowledged, that this great Act of supreme Power was appropriated to Bishops.

There is indeed one Instance in this Age produced by *Blondell*, and therefore not to be passed over, which seems to favour Ordination by Presbyters; and that is, that *Novatus* a Presbyter of the Church of *Carthage*, (for 'tis evident he was not a Bishop, notwithstanding whatever *Baronius* says) made *Felicissimus* a Deacon. *Ipse* (saith S. Cyprian, *Epist. 52.*) *Felicissimum satellitem suum Diaconum, nec permitte me, nec sciente, sua factione & ambitione constituit.* He says not that he ordained him, but by the Power of his Faction, (without Cyprian's Permission or Knowledge) made or constituted him a Deacon. This will be best understood by another Instance of *Novatus's* Actings, which follows a little after in the same Epistle. He tells us, that when *Novatus* sailed to *Rome*, *similia illic & paria molitus est.* "He did the like there, or somewhat that nearly resembled it, which he had afore done at *Carthage*. *Qui istic adversus Ecclesiam Diaconum fecit, illic Episcopum fecit.* "He who had there [*i. e.* at *Carthage*] in opposition to the Church, made a Deacon, there [at *Rome*] he made a Bishop. Now we know that he made a Bishop at *Rome*, viz. *Novatian*, not by ordaining him himself, but by procuring
three

three
liciss
by I
some
Lam
much
he ou
daine

To
mest
Title
in C
whic
Chur
of hi
expre
his b
himse
him,
Mena
their
vigor
pote
" ri
" vi
here
in hi
count
Clerg
himse
been
learn
Age,
Episc
Fif
S. Ign
and C
" Ep. c

three Bishops to do it. In like manner he made *Felicissimus* a Deacon at *Carthage*, not by ordaining him by Imposition of his own Hands, but by procuring some Bishop of his own Faction (such as *Privatus Lambestanus*) to do it; without the Knowledge, much less the Consent of his own Bishop, by whom he ought (if he had been worthy) to have been ordained. *V. Annal. Cypr. ad Ann. 250. S. 21.*

To conclude this, that the Bishop had the supreme Authority, I shall not only take notice of the Titles of ^p *Rektor*, ^o *Gubernator*, of ^p *Head*, ^q *Judge* in Christ, and the like, which are given to him; which shew the Authority the Bishop had in the Church; and St. Cyprian's calling the Ministers of his Church, ^r *Our Clergy*, *Our Presbyters*, which express his Superiority over them: But also from his blaming *Cornelius*, *Epist 59.* for not adhering to himself whilst he asserted this Authority. He tells him, that if he yielded, or was terrified by the insolent Menaces of the *African Schismatics*, who had made their Application to him; *actum est de Episcopatus vigore, & de Ecclesia gubernanda sublimi & divina potestate.* "There would be an End of the Authority of the Episcopate, and of that sublime and divine Power of governing the Church. I might have here shewn, that a Bishop was accounted so supreme in his own District in that Age, that he was not accountable to any other Bishop, much less to his own Clergy and People. Nay, that the Bishop of *Rome* himself stood upon the same Level. But this has been done by others, especially by the judicious and learned Author of *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, who has strenuously asserted the Cause of Episcopacy.

Fifthly, The Bishop was in that, as well as in S. Ignatius's time, the Principle of Unity. Unity and Christian Concord, was in the Primitive Church

^p Ep. 61.

^o Ibid.

^p Ep. 45.

^q Ep. 59. n. 5.

^r Ep. 40.

esteemed one of the great Duties of our Religion, and even the Badge of Christians, of which St. Cyprian discourses so excellently in his Book on that Subject: And in that, and other of his Works, displays the horrid Nature of Schism, which is the Breach of that Unity. Now both he, and other Writers of that Age, declare the Bishop to be the *Principle* of that Unity; that they who were in Communion with the Bishop, were within the Church; and that those were without it who were separated from him; and hence no Members of Christ, nor of that Society of which Christ was the Head. St. Cyprian tells *Pupianus*, *Epist.* 66. "That a Church is a People
 " united to their Priest, and a Flock adhering to
 " their Pastor: That thence he ought to know that
 " the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in
 " the Bishop; and that those who were not with
 " the Bishop, were not in the Church." See more that follows, where he speaks the same which St. Ignatius had done before him, (of which *Ch.* 7.) in his forecited excellent Book of the *Unity of the Church*, and in several of his Epistles, which I must not here recite, having spoken thereof in my *Preface*: Such as that the opposing or disowning the Bishop, is the rending of Christ's Church, the Rise of Heresies and Schisms, and a Crime that Martyrdom could not expiate.

Accordingly, when Christians travelled into foreign Parts, the Churches whither they came received them into Communion, as it appeared they were in Communion with the Bishop of that City or Diocese from whence they came. Hence it was customary for such to bring with them [*Literas formatas*] Letters of Recommendation from their own Bishop; by virtue of which, other Churches received these Persons into Communion, and hereby testified their own Communion with that Church, of which these Persons were originally Members; as on the contrary they rejected those who had been excommunicated by
 their

thei
 of a
 tory
 For
 shop
 ' an
 cator
 ther
 coun
 Char
 whic
 H
 nera
 term
 nods
 ful C
 in th
 fons,
 were
 " Ag
 certa
 can C
 Henc
 fed i
 such
 " an
 " nin
 Bisho
 ciens
 " nu
 " tha
 " wh
 " pif
 " in
 Instar
 unum
 " Epist.
 " E

their own Bishop. 'Tis true, that in the Vacancy of a See, the Presbyters did write such commendatory Letters; of which S. Cyprian takes notice *Epist. 9.* For these and the like Ends, the Names of the Bishops of each City were sent to foreign Churches; and each Bishop upon his Election, sent communicatory Letters to other Bishops, to acquaint them therewith, that they might not be imposed on by counterfeit Letters: Besides, they had Notes and Characters to know which were true and genuine, which * learned Persons have observed.

Hence all Affairs of the Church that were of general Concernment, were ordered by the joint Determination of Bishops assembled in provincial Synods for that end. To these S. Cyprian refers doubtful Cases, when they could conveniently meet; and in these when met, they were determined. The Persons, of which these Synods consisted in those Days, were Bishops, and not those of inferior Orders. " *Agrippinus met cum certis coepiscopis nostris*, with certain of his Fellow-Bishops, who governed the *African Churches*, and with them (*statuit*) he decreed, &c. Hence * St. Cyprian refers the Case of them who lapsed in times of Persecution to what was decreed in such a Synod. " When the Persecution was allayed, " and a convenient Opportunity presented of convening, (*copiosus Episcoporum numerus*) a number of Bishops met, &c. And a little after: *Ac si minus sufficiens Episcoporum in Africa numerus videbatur*; " If the " number of Bishops in *Africa* seem'd not sufficient for " that End, he sent to *Rome* to his Brother *Cornelius*, " who being assembled in Council (*cum plurimis coepiscopis* with many of his Fellow-Bishops, concurred " in the same Opinion with the *Africans*. Other Instances might be given, as that in *Epist. 73.* *In unum convenissemus tam provincia Africa quàm Numi-*

[†] *Epist. 59.*

[†] *Epist. 48.*

* v. Cl. Dodwelli Dissert. Cypr. 2.

[†] *Epist. 71.*

* *Epist. 71.*

166 *An History of the Government*

dia, Episcopi numero septuaginta & unus; where he mentions an Assembly of Bishops in number 71, out of the Provinces both of *Afric* and *Numidia*. It must be acknowledged, that when this Method of handling the Case of the *Lapsi* was pitched upon * by the Clergy of the Church of *Rome*, they mention the handling of it (*collatione conciliorum cum Episcopis, Presbyteris, Diaconis, Confessoribus, pariter & stantibus Laicis facta*) “ by a Conference first had “ with Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Confessors, and “ the Laity standing.” Yet this will not appear strange when we consider, that it is not the Determination of this Case, but the Examination of it, and at the farthest, the Approbation of the Decree, that was referred to all these; which is evident from the Reasons they give for it, *viz.* “ That it would “ appear invidious, if a thing wherein a Multitude “ was concerned, should not be examined by a Multitude; and that one should give Sentence, when “ the Guilt of so horrid a Crime was spread thro’ so “ many; neither could such a Decree be firm, “ which seemed not to have the Consent [or Approbation] of very many.” We find that such a Synod could not be called after *Fabian’s* Death, till another Bishop succeeded him, who was to moderate and govern, and to determine with Authority: And when they, by the Reasons they assign, seem to make this a special Case. ’Tis owned also, that in the *African* Council assembled about the baptising of Hereticks, as the Bishops, in Number 87, assembled; so they were accompanied with Presbyters and Deacons, and the People were present: Yet we find *S. Cyprian*, who presided, addressed his Speech only to the Bishops, whom he called his *Colleagues*, by which Title he could only mean the Bishops, (of which more presently;) and tells them, “ that each Bishop should freely speak his Mind, there

* *Cypr. Epist.* 30.

“ being an Equality among them, that there was no
 “ Bishop of Bishops, and none to compel his Col-
 “ legues to comply with his Sentiments; each Bishop
 “ having a right to judge:” It withal appears that
 only Bishops delivered their Opinions, and by them
 the Case was determined. And notwithstanding the
 aforecited Passage, we constantly find, that the Per-
 sons who were Members of Synods, were Bishops,
 and thence (as *Epist. 1.*) called *Concilium Episcoporum*: And when we have any mention of them that
 met in Synods, we are told, that it consisted of such
 a Number of Bishops. In general, that in the *A-*
frican Synod, there was a great Number of Bishops,
Ep. 55. That it was a Synod of 90 Bishops, who con-
 demned *Privatus* for his gross Crimes. *Ep. 59.* That
 the Determinations of Councils, whether of one or
 more Provinces, are called by *S. Cyprian* the Decrees of
 Bishops. *Statuissimus Collega, Ep. 48.* And he declares
 that he deferred the Case of the Lapsed, till the Divine
 Goodness would permit (*Episcopis in unum convenire*)
 the Bishops to meet together, that we might deter-
 mine (*Statueremus*) what was to be done. In that Sy-
 nod of *Rome*, in which * *Eusebius* tells us there were
 sixty Bishops; tho’ there were with them many Pres-
 byters and Deacons, yet the Bishops were they who
 composed the Synod, and made the Decree: As is
 evident from what *S. Cyprian* (*Ep. 55. n. 4.*) tells us,
 that his Collegue *Cornelius* with his Fellow-Bishops, de-
 creed the same thing, as the *African Synod* had de-
 creed before.

Farther, when in times of Persecution, Bishops
 could not assemble together in Council, the Affairs
 of the Church were transacted by them in their Let-
 ters, by which they communicated the State of Chri-
 stians, declared their own Minds, gave Directions
 how the Concerns of the Church should be managed,
 or else requested Advice in Difficulties and particu-

* *Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 43.*

168 *An History of the Government*

lar Emergencies. Now all these were tranſacted by Letters from one Biſhop to another, (unleſs where the See was vacant,) and theſe uſually ſent by Clergymen deputed to that purpoſe. By which 'tis evident that the Government of the Church reſided in the Biſhops.

Sixthly, All the Biſhops of the Catholick Church were at this time a *College*, of which each Biſhop was *Collega*, a Word which *S. Cyprian* is obſerved never to give to any Presbyters, nor to call any his *Collegues* but Biſhops. Tho' the Title, of *Brother*, be given to others, and Biſhops are ſtyled ſo by their Inferiors: As *S. Cyprian* by the Clergy of *Rome* and by *Moses*, &c. In this all Biſhops were related to each other, and made one *College*, which was the Principle of Unity to the Catholick Church (as one Biſhop was the Principle of Unity to a particular Church) and Chriſt the Principle of Unity to this College. Hence when any was ordained Biſhop, he (as appears in the Caſe of *Cornelius*) by his communicatory Letters gave notice thereof to other Biſhops, and thereupon, if there was no Controverſy about his Election, he was immediately owned by other Biſhops as their *Colleague*, and a Member of the *Collegium Sacerdotale*, the College of Biſhops. When by the baſe Pretences and Suggeſtions of the Schiſmatick *Novatian*, *Cornelius's* Right to be Biſhop of *Rome* was queſtion'd, *S. Cyprian*, (*Ep. 55.*) in order to convince *Antonianus* thereof, among other Arguments, tells him he was made Biſhop *a plurimis Collegis meis*, by many of his *Collegues*, 16 Biſhops who ordained him, that he was made ſuch *de Sacerdotum antiquorum & bonorum virorum Collegio*; by the College of Biſhops, who were (as he after deſcribes them) *in etate antiqui, in fide integri*, &c. As he ſtyles him his *Colleague*, ſo he ſhews that (upon his being traduced) *exploraſſe Collegas nostros*, that his *Collegues* the Biſhops of *Africa*, made a ſtrict ſearch whether he was guilty of what he was charged with. In other

Places

Place
S. Cyp
(Epist
mei,
for C
as Bi
Caſe
Epist
that
gis, v
he fl
them
ces,
when
are c
Auth
any c
Biſho
Dign
Chu
they
in th
that
difti
Se
to ha
that
from
him
men
shop
[the
But
poin
qui
" G
" th
" fa

Places of that Epistle the same Expression is used. S. Cyprian, to manifest that he was a true Bishop (*Epist. 66.*) tells *Pupianus* that *tot coepiscopi Collegæ mei*, so many Bishops, his *Colleagues*, who suffer'd for Christ, never made any Scruple of owning him as Bishop; when S. Cyprian was consulted about the Case of them that *Lapsed* in time of Persecution, *Epist. 56.* he expresses the Desire of those Bishops, that he might handle that matter *cum pluribus Collegis*, with many of his Colleagues, or Bishops, when he should, according to their custom, meet with them in a Synod after Easter. Many other Instances, was there need, might be produced'. Now when a *College* is a Society, the Members of which are collateral to each other, of equal Dignity and Authority, none of whom can claim Superiory over any other of the same College: And seeing that the Bishops are such a College, all of *equal* Power and Dignity, and each *first* and *supreme* in his own Church; and that Presbyters are not of this College, they being never styled by S. Cyprian, or any Bishop in that Age, his *College*: From hence 'tis manifest that in that Age Bishop and Presbyter were esteemed distinct Orders or Offices.

Seventhly, The Bishops in that Age are asserted to have received their Power from Christ himself; that they derive their Office from him, or at least from his Apostles, and by consequence from Christ himself; and to succeed the Apostles in the Government of the Church. S. Cyprian not only calls Bishops *Præpositos Divinâ dignatione*, Persons set over [the Church] by God's Designation, (as *Epist. 63.*) But also teaches that God did *constituere Episcopos* appoint Bishops. *Ep. 66.* And withal, appoint *Præpositos, qui Apostolis vicaria Ordinatione succedunt*. Such "Governors, who succeed the Apostles to supply "their room. And hence, that whatsoever Christ "said to the Apostles, he speaks to Bishops, who-

' Cypr. Ep. 68.

" soever

"soever heareth you, heareth me; and whosoever heareth me, heareth him that sent me. And he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." And after in the same Epistle, he saith, "that it was God, *qui Sacerdotes ordinat*, who ordained Bishops. For so the word *Sacerdotes* is generally used by S. Cyprian for Bishops, and 'tis clearly so in this place, where he is pleading for his own Episcopal Office. This he fully asserts, *Epist.* 33. Our Lord, saith he, *whose Precepts, we ought to obey, when designing to establish the Dignity of the Bishop, and the Constitution of the Church, said thus unto Peter, I say unto thee thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not overcome it, and I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven, &c. From hence thro' the Course of Times, and Successions, the Ordination of Bishops, and the Constitution of the Church proceeds, that the Church is established upon Bishops, and all the Acts of the Church are governed by these Presidents: When therefore this is founded upon a Divine Law, I wonder any durst write, &c.* Thus Firmilian also, who was Bishop of Casarea in Cappadocia, in his Epistle to S. Cyprian (*Epist.* 75.) thus writes; "The Power of remitting Sins was given to the Apostles, and to the Churches, which they, who were sent by Christ, had constituted; and to the Bishops, *qui eis ordinatione vicaria successorunt*, who by Ordination succeed in their room. And then he makes them the Enemies of the one Catholick Church, who are Enemies to Bishops, who succeed the Apostles." Now if they are Successors of the Apostles, then they are invested with the same ordinary Power wherewith the Apostles were invested. For (as Suidas observes) the word *βικαριος*, *vicarius* among the Romans is *ἐκδοχος* a Successor. And therefore that Expression of Firmilianus, and the same in S. Cyprian, *Ep.*

66. signifies, that Bishops derived their Power from the Apostles by a continued Succession, the Apostles ordaining some to that Office, and those ordaining others, and so successively down to that time. This clearly shews the Mind of *Firmilian* in that Epistle, n. 5. That all Power is established in the Church, where he says *Majores natu president*, "the Elders" "preside, who have the Power of Baptizing, of "Imposition of Hands, and of Ordaining." By *Majores natu*, 'tis evident, he means Bishops, who were called so answerably to the *Rosh avoth*, the Heads of Families among the Jews, who were Elders, tho' they had subordinate Elders under them: Of whom before, *Chap. III.* to which Place I refer the Reader. There, the Bishops, were the Fountain of all Authority in the Church, and those from whom the Power of Baptizing was communicated to Presbyters, but never that of Ordination.

Thus I have from these several Considerations sufficiently manifested that Bishops were in the time of *S. Cyprian* the supreme Officers in the Church, not only distinct from, but also superior to Presbyters, and this by Divine Institution.

But before I leave *S. Cyprian*, I must say something to rectify their Mistake, who confine a Bishop's District to a single Congregation. 'Tis evident that holy Martyr and his Age looked on this as an uncontroverted Point, that there could be but one Bishop, at the same time, of a City, whatever the Extent thereof was, or how great soever the Number of Christians was in that City. Thus *Cornelius* (in his 2 Epistle to *Fabius* Bishop of *Alexandria*) tells him, how *Novatian*, who set up himself as an *Anti-Bishop*, did not believe, [or at least not consider] *εἶνα δὲν ἐπίσκοπον ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, that there ought to be but one Bishop in a Catholick Church.

2 Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 43.

172 *An History of the Government*

And hence S. Cyprian (*Epist.* 55.) urges this in the Case of *Cornelius*, " that he was made Bishop of Rome
 " by the Appointment of God and Christ,—when
 " there was none made before him, and when the
 " Bishop's Throne was vacant upon the Death of
 " *Fabianus*, which is now filled by God's Approba-
 " tion, confirmed by all our Consent; whoever will
 " now take on him to be Bishop [of that See] must
 " of necessity be made so (*foris*) out of the Church,
 " neither can he have the Ordination of the Church,
 " who preserves not the Unity of the Church.
 " Whoever he is, and whatsoever he boasts of
 " himself, or challenges to himself; he is [in rea-
 " lity] Profane, an Alien, and out of the Church.
 " And when after the first there cannot be a second,
 " whoever is made Bishop after the first, who ought
 " to be (*Solus*) alone Bishop, (*non jam secundus ille,*
 " *sed nullus est*) is not a second Bishop, but no Bi-
 " shop, all which Reasoning is grounded on this
 " acknowledged Truth, that there could be but
 " one Bishop of one City. And, *Epist.* 69. he ar-
 " gues that *Novatian* who, after *Cornelius* had been
 " legally chosen and ordained Bishop of Rome, (tho'
 " he craftily got himself ordained by three weak
 " Bishops,) could not be Bishop, in that there could
 " be but one Church in a City, and therefore if it
 " was with *Novatian*, it was not with *Cornelius*,
 " but if it be with *Cornelius*, who by a lawful Or-
 " dination succeeded *Fabian*; then *Novatian* was
 " not in the Church, nor could be reputed a Bi-
 " shop." From which he infers that which he had
 before asserted, that none could be lawfully and va-
 lidly baptized, or receive the Gift of the Holy Spi-
 rit in the Communion of *Novatian*. Where by the
 way we may observe what S. Cyprian's Thoughts
 were of them who separated from their Bishop, and
 set up a distinct Communion; who, being not cast
 out by the Bishop, are of their own Accord Deser-
 ters and Fugitives from the Church; which he shews
 ought

ought to be preserved in the strictest Unity: That as the Baptism of these Schismatics is invalid, so they can have no Remission of Sins in that State of Separation: That, " tho' they profess to believe in " the same God, the Father the Son and the Holy " Ghost, yet this will not help them. That *Corah*, " *Dathan* and *Abiram* owned the same one true God " that *Moses* and *Aaron* did, and worship'd him by " the same Law: Yet seeing they, going beyond the " Bounds of their Ministry, transgressed against *Aa-* " *ron* the Priest, who had received the Priest- " hood by God's Designation and Ordination, " and challenged to themselves a Power to sa- " crifice, were immediately punished by God for " this their Usurpation; neither could any of " their Ministrations be valid, or their Sacrifi- " ces beneficial, when offered irreligiously and " unlawfully, contrary to his Divine Appoint- " ment. Yet (says he, a little after) these Men " made no Separation from the Church, nor went " out of it, but only in a hostile manner rebelled " against God's Priests: But these Men, rend the " Church of God in Pieces, are Rebels against Peace " and Christ's Unity, and endeavour to constitute " an [Episcopal] Throne, and to assume a Prima- " cy, and challenge a Power to baptise and (*of-* " *ferendi*) administer the Lord's Supper." But I return from this Digression, which I hope will not be unreasonable; especially, when my chief end in this Work is, to put a Stop to our mischievous unchristian Separations.

'Tis evident, that *S. Cyprian* and the Christians of his Age thought, that the Christians of one City, how numerous soever, made but one Church, and ought to be under one Bishop, and that there ought to be no more than one Bishop in one City. That when there was a Bishop settled in any City, who ought to be alone, for any other to pretend to be a Bishop there, he was *not a Second Bishop, but*
None.

174 *An History of the Government*

None. And this is asserted by *S. Cyprian* with Respect to the Church of *Rome* (*Epist.* 55.) in which there were at that time forty six Presbyters, and consequently an answerable Number of Christians for them to minister to, and such as would make near as many Congregations. I might dismiss this when *Blondel* himself has heaped up Citations out of *Cyprian* and others to prove this. *Apolog.* p. 188, 189— But however I will make this plain by taking a View of the Church of *Carthage*. 'Tis evident, that even before this, in the time of *Tertullian*, there were abundantly more Christians in that City than what could assemble in one Congregation (omitting what has before been cited out of him) when he tells *Scapula*, that he could not destroy the Christians there without making the City desolate. And that, in *S. Cyprian's* time, there were in that City many Presbyters, clearly appears, in that there were no fewer than five, who joined with *Felicissimus* in his Schism, and were excommunicated; and we cannot suppose that there was a less Number that persisted in their Union with their Bishop; when likewise in the Persecution under *Decius*, some of the Brethren lapsed, and also some of the Clergy (*Cleriportio*, *Epist.* 14.) And when *S. Cyprian* blames some of the Presbyters, (four of whom he names, *Donatus*, *Fortunatus*, *Novatus* and *Gordius*) for their unreasonable Indulgence towards them that had lapsed; and we cannot imagine but there were several others of them who behaved themselves suitably to their Duty and Function; when withal, *S. Cyprian* gives Direction (*Epist.* 5.) that the Presbyters should in their Courses visit and administer the Eucharist to them who were in Prison, and Confessors for Christ, *quia mutatio personarum & vicissitudo convenientium minuit invidiam*: “ Because the Change of Persons, and
“ their taking their turns in coming to them would
“ lessen the Envy;” This, I say, fully intimates the considerable Number of Presbyters in that City, even then

then
time
Mart
notw
needs
Perse
Presb
no m
confic
cons
by th
cise M
ther
Corne
of Ro
ven I
lyths
keepe
the C
tion?
thage
Presb
ritory
strict
fured
in the
somet
other
byter
Churo
its B
such C
own P
As 't
Terri
find i
Rural

• En

then when some of them had fallen away in that time of Persecution; when the Visits made to those Martyrs were so frequent, if not daily: Otherwise notwithstanding their taking their turns, they must needs be taken notice of and be maligned by their Persecutors. Now what need was there of so many Presbyters in the Church of *Carthage*, if it had been no more than one Congregation? Especially, if we consider, that besides these, there were several Deacons, Subdeacons and Lectors who are mentioned by this holy Martyr. Tho' we know not the precise Number of the *Carthaginian* Presbyters and other Clergy; yet in the forecited ^a Epistle to *Fabius Cornelius* declares the Number of them in the Church of *Rome*, at this time, viz. forty six Presbyters, seven Deacons, as many Subdeacons, forty two Acolyths, and fifty two Exorcists, Lectors and Doorkeepers. For what end were all these Officers, if the Church had been no more than one Congregation? But, confining ourselves to the Church of *Carthage*, we find (*Epist.* 34.) mention of one *Gainus* a Presbyter at *Didda*, probably a Village in the Territory of *Carthage*; however within *S. Cyprian's* District, as also of his Deacon. By which we are assured that *S. Cyprian's* Diocese was not confin'd within the Walls of *Carthage*, tho' a great City, which sometimes rivalled *Rome* it self; but that there were other Places that had Church-Officers, viz. a Presbyter and a Deacon, and yet was a Member of the Church of *Carthage*, and under the Jurisdiction of its Bishop. And possibly there might be many more such Country-Congregations, who were under their own Presbyter, yet subject to the Bishop of *Carthage*: As 'tis evident that most Cities had a considerable Territory belonging to their Jurisdiction. And we find in *Firmilian's* ^b Epistle, Presbyter *Rusticus*, a Rural Presbyter mentioned; tho' I own the word

^a *Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 43.*

^b *Inter Cypr. Epist. 75. n. 8.*

Rusticus

176 *An History of the Government*

Rusticus will admit of another Sense. As for the City of *Carthage* it self, if we may make a Computation of Christian Assemblies from what they were in S. *Augustine's* time, we may conclude they had many Congregations, tho' but one Bishop; when that Father mentions several Churches, that (in the Language of later times) were Parochial. They are collected by Bishop *Stillingfleet*, in his *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 249. Besides the *Basilica Major*, in which the Bishop sat, there were *Basilica Fausti*, *Leontiana*, *Celerina*, *Novarum*, *Petri*, *Pauli*; besides two without the City, and probably many others which he had not observed, and possibly many more which S. *Augustine* had no occasion to mention. Now tho' we allow of a great Advance of the Number of Christians from S. *Cyprian's* time to this; yet not so great, but that in S. *Cyprian's* Days they vastly exceeded that of a single Congregation, from that glorious Success the Gospel of Christ found every where; besides (which has been observed) the great Number of Christians at *Carthage* even in *Tertullian's* time, and of Presbyters in S. *Cyprian's*. Now how shall we account for the Bishops and Churches of *Africa*, whom the *Nonconformists* magnifie as the great Preservers of Primitive and Apostolick Constitutions; that they should be ignorant of the Nature of Churches, or otherwise so defective in their Duty, that when Christians were multiplied in Cities, they should not divide them into particular Churches, and set over each of them a Bishop; if they knew (and they, being nearer that time, had the best means of being acquainted therewith) that none but Congregational Churches were of the Apostles Institution? But of such a Division of Cities, and appointing particular Bishops over them, they have not, nor can produce one single Instance. No, this was an established Rule, that there should be but one Bishop in a City. Had this Maxim been known, that when

Christians

Christians were so multiplied in a City so as not to be able to assemble in one Congregation, they should be parted into several Churches, over each of which a Bishop should be appointed; 'tis strange that bad Men should not make use of this to excuse their Schism, and good Men to heal the Rents and Divisions that happened in their time. *Fortunatus* might have defended his setting himself up a Bishop, by alleging that the Christians in the great City of *Carthage* were too numerous to be under the Inspection of *Cyprian*: And to be sure *Novatian* might have had that pretence against *Cornelius's* feeding the great Flock at *Rome*. But this was never alledged, in that it was owned on both Sides, that there ought to be but one Bishop of a City, tho' never so large. By this likewise good Men might have healed Schisms, by parting the City into two or more Dioceses, and giving to each Competitor his Share: Particularly in the Schism of the *Donatists*, which so sadly distracted the *African* Churches. *Cecilian* might have been contented with the People that were willing to communicate with him, and *Majorinus* with his Party. No, this would not do; it being a Maxim universally received, and allowed both by *Catholicks* and *Donatists* (in the Conference they had at *Carthage*, in order to compose Differences) that only one Bishop was to preside in a City or Diocese.

From what has been said, it appears that *Carthage* and other Cities of *Africa* were governed by Bishops, superior to Presbyters, both in and before S. *Cyprian's* time; that both he and others then judged that Government instituted by, and derived from, Christ and his Apostles: That *these* were the supreme Governors in each Church; that the Power of Ordination, Church-censures and Absolution was in *them*; that their Authority extended to the Government over the whole Church of which they were Bishops, both the Clergy and the People; that

178 *An History of the Government*

the Bishops throughout the whole World were a *College*, of which each Bishop was a *Colleague*, but not Presbyters, and consequently these were distinct Offices. And farther, that the Church of *Carthage* was (as many others were) of that large Extent, as very much to exceed a single Congregation, and yet under one Bishop. I might have shewn likewise from *S. Cyprian's Works*, and what accompanies them, that was written at the same time, that Churches were then universally governed by Bishops: As appears from the *Epistles* written by them, and to them, and concerning them, in the Churches of *Africa*, *Italy* and *Spain*; also in *Asia*, shewn by the Epistle of *Firmilian* a Bishop in *Cappadocia*; and also from the many Synods of Bishops, occasionally mention'd in that Epistle and elsewhere.

But, omitting that, I shall here only observe, that *S. Cyprian* had not only a *Diocesan Jurisdiction*, of which he speaks, *Epist.* 81. but also a *Metropolitcal*: When we find (*Epist.* 55. n. 12.) not only mention of his Province (*Provincia nostra*) and the Bishops therein; but also (*Ep.* 48.) that his Province was of large Extent; having in it (besides the Proconsular *Africa*, of which *Carthage* was the chief City) *Numidia* and the two *Mauritanias*. In the former of which Citations, (*Ep.* 55.) he mentions (*Antecessores nostros*) his Predecessors: Which shews, that this Metropolitcal Power was not a Novelty in *S. Cyprian's* time in the *African Churches*. This I briefly observe, that our dissenting Brethren, who profess a great Regard for those Churches, may have the kinder Thoughts for it, as it is the established Government of the Church of *England*. And we may observe that there was not only a Bishop at *Carthage*, but also that in the neighbouring Territories, Bishops were settled in Cities, in both *Mauritanias*, in *Numidia*, in the Regions of *Tripolis*, in *Byzacena*, and *Zeugitana*, as appears especially from the Names of the Bishops and of their Sees, as they gave their Judgment

ment in the Council of *Carthage*, wherein *S. Cyprian* presided, about the Baptism of Hereticks; to which I refer the Reader.

Withal, 'tis evident, there were at that time Bishops in *France*; and as we observed *Pothinus* and *Irenæus* in earlier times were Bishops of *Lyons*, (of which *Ch. VIII.*) so at this time *Faustinus* was Bishop of that City, who we find (*Epist. 68.*) had made his Application to *S. Cyprian*, with other Bishops of the same Province, who complain of another Bishop, viz. *Martianus* Bishop of *Arles*, for his joining with the *Novatians*. About which time we likewise hear of Bishops in *Spain*, from the sad Apostacy of two of them, viz. *Martialis* and *Basilides*, who by committing Idolatry in time of Persecution, fell from their Christianity, and consequently much more from their Episcopal Office and Dignity, *Epist. 67.* Of whom more in the next Chapter.

CHAP. XI.

Bishops in Spain, France, Britain, &c. *Of Acrius.*

FROM what has been said in the former Chapter, the Reader may find not only that Bishops were instituted by the Apostles, but also that they were settled in all Churches, wherever we have any Account of the Reception of the Gospel, and the Plantation of such Churches. This I shall briefly recapitulate, with some farther Observations, tho' not in the former Order. I'll begin with the western Part of the World, viz. *Spain*, with which I concluded the last Chapter. As *St. Paul* purposed

a Journey thither, there to preach the glad Tidings of Salvation (*Rom. 15. 24, 28.*) So learned Men think that he effected it, being induced, as on other Reasons, so by the Testimony of his Fellow-labourer *St. Clement* (*Ep. ad Corinth. c. 5.*) who tells us that he came (*ἐπὶ τὰ τελευτὰ τῆς οὐσίας*) to the farthest Bounds of the West; in his Journeys after his Release out of Prison, for the Instruction of the World; and we may well suppose that God gave the like Success to his Labours there, as in other Places. Hence in ^b *Irenæus's* time we find mention of Churches in *Hiberia*, which when joined with those in *Germany* and among the *Celtae*, must denote *Spain*, and not *Iberia* betwixt the *Euxin* and *Caspian* Seas. And a little after ^c *Tertullian* reckons *Hispaniarum omnes Terminos*, the several Countries of *Spain* among the Countries which were Christ's Subjects. After this general Notice of Christians, we have no farther Account of them. (For as for the Story of *St. James's* coming thither, the Authors are late, of no Credit, and inconsistent with the sacred History, which makes *St. James*, the Brother of *St. John*, suffer Death immediately after the Apostles were, by *St. Peter's* Vision, convinced of the Lawfulness of preaching to the Gentiles; and we cannot imagin the other *St. James* would leave *Jerusalem*, of which he was Bishop, to travel thither.) I say, we have no farther Account (that I know) of Christians in *Spain*, in any uncontested Monuments of Antiquity, till we find the Zeal of some Bishops and other Christians there, expressing it self for the Truth, and the Welfare of their Churches, when they made Application to ^d *St. Cyprian* and other *African* Bishops, complaining of their own Apostate Idolatrous Bishops, and making

^a By which some would not only have *Spain* understood, but even *Britain* it self, as *Bp. Stillingfleet* in his *Orig. Britan.*

^b *Iren. adv. Her. l. 1. c. 3.*

^c *Tertull. adv. Juda. c. 7.*

^d *Cypr. Epist. 67.*

their Requests for Directions how to act in that Case. There we have the Names of the two Apostatizing Bishops, *Basilides* and *Martialis*, who seem, by the Inscription of the Epistle in Answer to the Complainants, to have been Bishops of *Leon* and *Asturia*, or else of *Emerita*: And also of two other Bishops of that Country, *Felix* and *Sabinus*, who came into *Africa* to represent the Practices of the Deserters; and in the Directions given by St. *Cyprian* and the *Africans*, *Episcopi ejusdem Provinciae proximi*, the next Bishops of that Province are expressly mentioned as the Persons who ought to meet, and ordain others in the room of the Apostates; as they observe had been done in the Ordination of *Sabinus*; by all which 'tis evident that Bishops were then settled in *Spain*.

I find nothing more of the Churches of *Spain*, till the beginning of the next Century, fifty Years after the former, and that gives us a farther Account of Bishops in that Country: This was at the Council of *Eliberis* or *Elvira*; which was assembled in the Year 305. As the Place of the Assembly was in *Spain*, so were the Bishops and their Sees, most, if not all, except *Catonius* or *Cantonius* Bishop of *Corfica*, to the Number of nineteen: Among whom we find the Name of *Osius*, then Bishop of *Corduba*; whether the same who afterwards presided in the Council of *Nice*, and of whom after that we have frequent mention, I leave to learned Persons to determine.

I might have likewise observed how in the Council of *Arles*, which was held after that of *Eliberis*, and eleven Years before that of *Nice*, there were several Bishops, from the Province of *Bœtica*, of *Tarragon*, and from *Casaraugusta* or *Saragoza*. But here's enough to shew how early Bishops were settled in *Spain*, and that besides those general Expressions of *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, we have no Account of any

182 *An History of the Government*

Churches in *Spain*, till therewith we find mention of their Bishops.

The same may be said of *France*, when the *Celta* are named by *Irenaus*, and *Galliarum diversæ nationes* by *Tertullian* as Christ's Subjects: I shall not go about to determine by whom converted, whether by *Crescens*, whom some bring thither, being sent (2 *Tim.* 4.) not as we read it into *Galatia*, but into *Gallia*; or by *St. Luke*, who *Epiphanius Her.* 51. tells us, (I wish he had produced his Author) preached the Gospel in *France* first, as also in *Dalmatia*, *Italy* and *Macedon*; or by *St. Philip*, as *Isidor*; or more probably by *St. Paul* himself, either in his Journey into *Spain*, or from thence into *Britain*. I shall not trouble the Reader with the seven Bishops whom *Gregory of Tours* makes the Converters of that Nation; much less with the Tales of *S. Maximin*, *Lazarus*, &c. now justly exploded by learned Men. But I shall take Notice of that excellent Monument of Antiquity; the Epistle of the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lyons* to the Churches of *Asia* and *Phrygia*, written before the Year 170, in the time of *Antoninus Verus*; in which we find mention not only of Churches in *France*, but also the Names of several Christians who with great Constancy suffer'd as Martyrs, and among these the blessed *Pothinus* Bishop of *Lyons*, who, tho' above ninety Years of Age, with the greatest Courage endured the severest Tortures of his Persecutors. As we find in that Epistle this Excellent Bishop of *Lyons*, so ² in another, written by those Martyrs, whilst in Prison, to *E-leutherus* Bishop of *Rome*, the Name of *Irenaus*, whom they recommend ὡς περὶ βύτιον ἐκκλησίας, as a Presbyter of the Church; for he was only such during the Life of *Pothinus*, tho' after his Death he succee-

* This the Reader may see discussed by *Petrus de Marca* in his Letter to *H. Valesius* before his Edition of *Eusebius's Eccl. Hist.*

¹ *Euseb. H. E. l. 5. c. 1.*

² *Ibid. cap. 54.*

ded him as Bishop of that Church : Of which before Ch.VIII. So early do we find Bishops in *France*, when the later of these, *Irenaus*, had seen *Polycarp* St. *John's* Disciple : And if *Pothinus* who was before him, had been Bishop any considerable Part of his Life, he must have been very near the time of the Apostles.

The next Account of uncontested Authority concerning Churches in *France* is the Council of *Arles*, A.D. 314. where there were some Bishops out of other Countries, but the most of any one Country were those of *Gallia*, which was then bounded on the East by the *Rhine*. And the Bishops are expressly distinguished from the Presbyters, some of whom attended on that Council. The Bishops of *Arles*, *Vienna*, *Vasio* or *Vaison*, *Orange*, *Carpentoracum* or *Carpentras*, *Remes*, *Roan*, *Autun*, *Coln*, *Bourdeaux*, &c. are named. And these as superior to Presbyters, and others of inferior Orders, who are mentioned as Attendants on their Bishops.

Here's sufficient to evince that the Churches of *France* were from the beginning, so far as we have any Notice of them, governed by Bishops.

The like might be shewn of the Churches of *Britain*, of which the Reader, from our immediate concern herein, may expect a fuller Account ; but as this Island is divided from the rest of the World, so it has escaped the Notice of secular Historians in respect to its civil Concerns, till invaded by the *Romans* ; and also in respect to its Ecclesiastical Concerns, the Notice of the first *Greek* and *Latin* Writers, to whom we are beholden for an Account of the Propagation of the Gospel in the first Ages. We know indeed from ^h *Tertullian*, that the *Britains*, who were (*intra Oceani sui ambitum conclusi*) confined within the bounds of their own Ocean, were not shut out of Christ's Church, and that *Britannorum Romanis inaccessa loca*, even those Parts of *Britain*

^h *Adv. Judæos* c. 7.

which were not conquered by the *Romans*, were become the Subjects of the King of Kings; besides the Testimonies of *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, *Gildas* and others, who tho' later were inquisitive Persons, and had means to be acquainted herewith, who assure us that in the times of the Apostles the Gospel was here preached and entertained; but by whose particular Ministry this was effected, is not so manifest. As for the Report of *Joseph* of *Arimathea's* and *Simon Zelotes's* preaching here, when not mention'd till above a thousand Years after their time; and the Conversion of King *Lucius* by *Missionaries* from *Rome*, when unknown in former times, tho' made use of even in later Councils to advance the Honour of our Nation; I pass them over, referring the Reader, for the Account thereof, to the indefatigable Labours of the admirable Archbishop *Usher* in his *Primord. Eccles. Britan.* and those of the excellent Bishop *Stillingfleet* in his *Orig. Britan.* This later thinks it most probable that *St. Paul* was the Converter of this Nation, when *St. Clement* tells us of his preaching to the utmost bounds of the West; and when backed with the Authorities of *Eusebius* and *Theodoret*; when *St. Paul* had time enough for this, after his Release from his Imprisonment at *Rome*, and Encouragement to undertake this Work. We hear no more of the Churches of *Britain* till the times of *Dioclesian*, in which *Gildas* mentions a *Persecution*, *Bede* and others the Martyrdom of *St. Alban*, &c. But ⁱ *Eusebius* and ^k *Lactantius*, who lived at that time, and thence, were best acquainted with Transactions then, tell us that it proceeded no farther here than the demolishing of the Christian Temples; *Constantius Chlorus*, whose Province *Britain* was, so far complying with his Persecuting Partners of the Empire, but not destroying his Christian Subjects, as they did.

Hitherto our Account of the *British Church* has

ⁱ *Euseb. vit. Constant. l. i. c. 13.*

^k *Lact. de Mort. Persecut.*
been

been general and scanty, but a little after, *A. D.* 314. we find at the Council of *Arles*, not only mention of some Churches in this Province, but also of the Bishops that governed them, who were present at that Council, and subscribed to it, *viz.* *Eborius* Bishop of *York*, *Restitutus* Bishop of *London*, and *Adelfus* Bishop *de Civit. Col. Lond.* which is supposed by the learned Bishop *Stillington* to be read *Civit. Col. Leg. 11.* and to signify the *Colony* of the *Second Legion*, or *Caerleon* on *Isca*. And that as *Britain* was then divided into three Provinces, so out of each of these (and probably the Metropolitans) there were summoned one Bishop; as it was customary at that time. However that is, we find here, in the beginning of the Reign of the first Christian Emperor, *Constantine* the Great, Bishops settled in these Churches: And we have no Reason to doubt, but that there was a Succession of them from the planting of Christianity in this Island, tho' their Names are not transmitted to us, as is shewn with respect to the Church of *Carthage*: And therefore (as the forecited learned Prelate observes) " Altho', by
" the Loss of Records of the *British* Churches, we
" cannot draw down the Succession of Bishops from
" the Apostles time, yet we have great Reason to
" presume such a Succession; when, upon the sum-
" moning a Council by *Constantine*, three *British* Bi-
" shops appeared, one out of every Province, as they
" did in other Parts.

Before I proceed to the Government of the Churches in the Northern Part of *Britain*, since called *Scotland*, which I shall presently consider; I observe that the Council of *Arles* shews us, that there were Bishops who came to the Council in other Countries, of whose Christianity before that time we have no Notice, however very little*. We

* 'Tis true, the Mention of Letters sent into Sicily by the Clergy of Rome, (inter *Cypr. Ep. 30.*) shews there were Christians there, and possibly there may be the like incidental Mention of them, and others elsewhere.

186 *An History of the Government*

find from *Sicily*, *Sixtus*, according to *Binius*, &c. or as 'tis in *Eusebius*, *H. E.* l. x. c. 5. *Chrestus* Bishop of *Syracuse*, whose Summons to that Council we have there recorded; From *Sardinia*, *Quintus* Bishop of *Caralis*, (as in the Council of *Eliberis*, a Bishop of *Corfica*) as also from *Dalmatia*, *Theodorus* Bishop of *Aquileia*.

As for *Italy*, besides the Succession of Bishops in *Rome* the imperial City, which has been observed, we find by the Councils there held, that other Cities were governed by Bishops, by their assembling in those Councils. This the *Roman* Clergy intimate in their Epistle to *St. Cyprian*, (*Ep.* 30.) *cum Episcopis*, by which must be meant neighbouring Bishops, in the Case of the *Lapsi*. Besides the sixteen Bishops who ordained *Cornelius*, and the three that were craftily imposed on to ordain *Novatian*. I have observed *Chap.* 8. early mention of Bishops in *Thrace*, as in *Greece*, at *Corinth* and *Athens*; in *Asia minor*, at *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, &c. in *Pontus*, *Cappadocia*, *Lycaonia*, *Cilicia*, *Arabia*, and even in *Scythia*; besides the more early mention of Bishops in *Syria*; chiefly at *Antioch*, famous for giving the honourable Name of Christians to the Embracers of the Faith of Christ, and one of its first Bishops the blessed Martyr *Ignatius*, the Names of whose Successors *Eusebius* has preserved, (*H. E.* l. 4. c. 20.) viz. *Heron*, *Cornelius*, *Eros*, *Theophilus*; (and l. 5. c. 19.) *Maximinus*, and *Serapion*, whose Epistle against the *Cataphrygians*, mentions a Bishop of *Hierapolis*, viz. *Apollinaris*, who wrote against the same Heresy, and tells us of the Subscription of other Bishops who concurred with him in the condemning the same Hereticks. I might reckon the Bishops of *Palestine*, of *Tyre*, *Emisa*, *Gaza*, and others mentioned by *Eusebius*, (*H. E.* l. 8. c. 8.) who were Martyrs for Christ. But omitting others, I must again take notice of the Succession of Bishops in the great Mother Church of *Jerusalem*, in which

which (as I have observed Ch. 4.) St. James was placed by the Apostles themselves; and *Eusebius* names his Successors till that City had for a time lost its Name of *Jerusalem*, and was called *Ælia*; before which the Bishops were always of *Jewish* Extraction, as afterwards, when the *Jews* were banished thence, and the City peopled with a Colony of *Gentiles*, the Bishops were always of the Uncircumcision. *Eusebius* (H. E. l. 5. c. 12.) tells us their Names from the Archives of that Church. The first of them was *Marcus*, then *Cassianus*, *Publius*, *Maximus*, *Julianus*, *Caius*, *Symmachus*, then another *Caius*, another *Julianus*, *Capito*, *Valens*, *Delichianus*, and then *Narcissus* ¹, who retired on a false Accusation, and afterwards returned, ^m his Successor, (who was chosen in his extreme old Age) *Alexander*, who in the Persecution of *Decius*, dyed in Prison for Christ's sake. Him ⁿ *Mabazanes* succeeded, whom *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria* puts in the List of many other Bishops, who agreed in their Sentiments, in Opposition to *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*. As for the next Successors in that See, I refer the Reader to the forenamed Historian; and should have concluded with the Bishops of this, which was the Mother of all other Churches, but that I am obliged to take notice of one City more in *Palestine*, viz. *Cæsarea*, for the sake of one Bishop thereof, *Eusebius*, to whom we are so much indebted for those excellent Remains of the Acts and Monuments of the Christian Church, which he so diligently collected. The first Bishop of that City which I find mentioned by *Eusebius*, ^o was *Theophilus*, who presided in the Synod of *Palestine*, which met about the *Paschal* Controversy. And there ^p *Theodotistus*, who admired *Origen*, and probably was that Bishop

¹ *Euseb. H. E. l. 6 c. 9. 10.* ^m *Ibid. c. 11.* ⁿ *Ibid. c. 39. and l. 7. c. 5.* ^o *Ibid. l. 5. c. 23.* ^p *Ibid. l. 6. c. 27.*

of *Cæsarea*,⁹ that joined with the Bishop of *Jerusalem* in ordaining him. ¹ *Domnus* succeeded *Theoctistus*, then ² *Theotenus*, then *Agapius*. But the Person that I shall particularly take notice of, was *Eusebius*, who lived in the latter End of the third Century, and in the beginning of the fourth, because he acquaints us in his History with the Succession of Bishops in several Churches, from the founding of those Churches, shewing us, that they were placed therein by the Apostles themselves, and rightly concludes that the Government by Bishops was instituted by the Apostles. The Succession of Bishops in many Sees, as delivered by him, we have already seen: What his Thoughts were of the Institution of Bishops, appears in many Places of his History: Particularly *l. 3. c. 4.* Where having named them who were the Apostles Fellow-Labourers, and Pastors of Churches; he tells us, “ That of these *Timothy* is reported to be the first to whom was allotted the Bishoprick (*ἐπισκοπίας*) “ of the Diocese of *Ephesus*, as to *Titus* the Churches of *Crete*. Afterwards thus. “ Among the “ rest of the Followers of *Paul*, *Crescens* was sent “ by him into *Gallia*, [or *Galatia*], as he himself testifies; *Linus*, whom he mentions in his second “ Epistle to *Timothy*, as being with him at *Rome*, “ was the first who after *St. Peter* was chosen Bishop “ of *Rome*: And *Clemens* who was owned by *Paul* “ as his Fellow-Labourer and Fellow-Wrestler, was “ the third Bishop of the Church of *Rome*. And besides these, *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, who *Luke* “ tells us in the *Acts*, was the first Believer after the “ Apostle’s Speech made to the *Athenians* in *Areopagus*, “ was made the first Bishop of the Church of *Athens*; “ as another *Dionysius*, an ancient Writer, who was “ Pastor of the Church of *Corinth*, relates. But “ who they were who succeeded the Apostles, [as “ Bishops of Churches] in order of time, shall be

⁹ *Euseb. H. E. l. 9. c. 8.*¹ *Id. l. 7. c. 14.*² *Ibid. c. 32.*

“ decla-

“ declared in the Sequel of this History.” And accordingly he relates the Succession of the Bishops of many eminent Churches from the times of the Apostles themselves; and this out of the Archives of those Churches, which he had the Advantage of seeing, and the Curiosity and Industry to peruse; and makes these Bishops Successors of the Apostles in governing the Church. That hence as Dr. *Potter* observes, “ It is as impossible for any impartial Man, who shall compare this Historian with the rest of the primitive Fathers, to doubt whether there was a Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, as it would be to call in question the Succession of Roman Emperors from *Julius Caesar*, or the Succession of Kings in any other Country.

To conclude this, wherever we find in these first times any Churches we find them governed by Bishops. How could this happen, that Churches, tho’ at a great distance from each other, that had no Intercourse, that were scarce known by Name to each other, should all agree in this one Form of Church-Government; had it not been received by them together with the Christian Faith, either immediately from the Apostles themselves, or from their pious Converters, who received both from the Apostles?

We must indeed acknowledge, that there was one Person, in the fourth Century; who taught that Presbyters were equal with Bishops, and had the same Power; this was *Aerius*. But then we are to consider what the Church thought of his Opinion, and what Sentence was then passed on himself. His Opinion was not only accounted singular, but also grossly erroneous; and for it he was branded as an *Heretick*. And thus he was esteemed, not merely because he was an *Arian*, but also from his new Opinion, and his striving to propagate it by procuring to himself Followers. For as *Epiphanius* informs us (*Hæres.* 55. or 75.) he asserted that Bishop and Presbyter

190 *An History of the Government*

byter were the same; and that on this Reason he's reckoned as (μανιώδης) a Madman. For as *Epiphanius* argues, "How can this be, when the Office of Bishops is for propagating Fathers, the other [of Presbyters,] when it cannot beget Fathers, begets Sons to the Church by the Laver of Regeneration [Baptism] but not Fathers and Teachers. For how is it possible that he should (καθιστᾶν) constitute or ordain a Presbyter (μὴ ἔχοντα χειροθεσίαν ἢ χειροτονεῖν) who has no Authority to impose hands in Ordination?" And then *Epiphanius* takes notice of *Aerius's* Arguments from *St. Paul's* Epistles, as his writing to Presbyters and Deacons, and not to Bishops, &c. And answers by shewing that *Aerius's* Error proceeded from his not observing that "the Apostle wrote (πρὸς τὰ ἐκκοπιπλονία) "suitable to the Circumstances of his own time; that Churches, at their first Plantation, had only need of Presbyters and Deacons:" And illustrates the gradual Progress of the Settlement of the Christian Church (probably with some Mistakes) by that of the *Israelitish* State under *Moses*. And after argues from *1 Tim. 5. 1.* *Rebuke not a Presbyter, but exhort him as a Father*; why should he bid *Timothy* a Bishop, not to rebuke a *Presbyter*, if he had not a superior Power over him? And from *v. 19.* that the Power of receiving Accusations against Bishops was not entrusted to Presbyters; nor did *St. Paul* write to any Presbyters not to rebuke Bishops.

C H A P.

* *Blonde*
Government

C H A P. XII.

Of the first Government of the Church of Scotland.

W H E N the Adversaries of Episcopal Government ^a argue against its universal Reception in all Churches in the first Ages, from an Instance of the Churches of *Scotland*, which are reported by some of their Historians to be at first governed by Monks and Presbyters without Bishops; I am obliged, it being contrary to what I have hitherto observed, to take notice of it. It has indeed been particularly and satisfactorily considered by a learned Prelate, Dr. *W. Lloyd*, then Bishop of *St. Asaph*, since of *Worcester*, ^b to which I might refer the Reader, without troubling my self any farther therein; but I shall give a brief Extract thereof, partly in the Words of that learned Prelate, and partly in those of the learned and judicious Mr. *Collier*, in his excellent *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*. The first Author of this Account is *Fordon*, who as of himself, one of slender Credit; so living so late as in the fourteenth Century, is too late to have his Testimony regarded in that which was so many hundred Years before his own time, unless he had produced some Historian of that Age as his Voucher; tho' too easily embraced by later Historians, and improved by *Hector Boethius*. But besides, the Story betrays its own Credit. He affirms, " That there were a sort of Men that governed the Affairs of Religion in *Scotland*, long before the coming of *Palladius*, which yet were no Bishops, but only Monks, with the Character of Priesthood;

^a *Blondel* p. 14.

^b In his Historical Account of Church Government in Great Britain and Ireland.

“ which

“ which Priests were the famous *Culdees*, mentioned “ by later *Scotish* Historians.” To refute which, let the Reader consider, first, that Christianity was not embraced in *Scotland*, before the coming of *Palladius*, nor indeed for a considerable time after; that *Palladius* his Mission was into *Ireland*, whose Inhabitants then were called *Scoti*, as is sufficiently proved by Archbishop *Usher* in his *Britannicæ Eccl. Antiquit.* And there *Palladius*’s Stay was too short to make any great Progress in the Conversion of that Nation; consequently, too little to afford him any leisure to preach to the Inhabitants of that Nation now called *Scotland*: So that the Supposition of *Palladius*’s coming into *Scotland*, is precarious, and consequently the Foundation of the former Account rotten. Besides, as Bishop *Lloyd* has observed and evidently shewn, the Story of the Church of *Scotland*’s being governed by Presbyters, is directly contrary to the Account which is given us by other credible Historians, who tells us that the *British* Church was governed by Bishops, some of whom were at the Council of *Arles* (convened *A. D.* 311) and that of *Ariminum*; that mention is made of them by *Gildas*, and after by *Bede*, in Contests between them and *Augustin* the Converter of the *Saxons*; and withal, that the *Scots*, both before their coming into this Island, and after, were under the same Government with the *Britains*; as also were the *Picts*, who were the ancient Inhabitants of that northern Part of *Britain*. This is evident concerning the *Scots*, whilst they lived in *Ireland*, where they were first converted to Christianity. The first Tradition we have thereof names *Kiaranus*, *Ailbeus*, and other Bishops, by whom those early Christians there were governed. As for *Palladius*, if he was any way instrumental in promoting Christianity, for which he was sent into that Island, he was ordained a Bishop at *Rome*: and the same we are told of *St. Patrick*, to whom the Honour of the general Conversion of that Nation is ascribed.

ascribed. This Person was one of the *British* Church which was governed by Bishops; had all three Orders of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon in his own Family. *St. Martin* Bishop of *Tours* was his Uncle, with whom he some time lived, as he did with *St. German* Bishop of *Auxerre*. He was actually ordained Bishop in *France*, and made Archbishop by Pope *Celestine*, when he undertook that excellent Design of converting the *Scotish* or *Irish* Nation. After he had made Progress in that Work, he formed that Nation into Diocesan Churches, and ordained thirty Bishops of the *Britains*, who accompanied and assisted him. Besides, tho' there were Differences betwixt *Rome* and the *Scots* afterwards, as about the time of keeping *Easter*; yet it was never objected against them, that they were not governed by Bishops, nor was any Defect found in their Orders. Nay, Pope *John's* Epistle is directed in the first place to *Tomianus*, *Columbanus*, *Dimanus*, and other Bishops, and after to some Presbyters; in which tho' he blames them about their Celebration of *Easter*, yet nothing in respect to their Form of Government, or Orders. And as for the *Scots* retaining the same Government by Bishops after they settled in *North-Britain*, we have no Ground to question it, not only in that this was the Government they were accustomed to, but also what they found settled here, both in the Southern Part of this Island, and also in the northern, where they fixed their Habitation.

This is plain, both in reference to the *South-Picts* and the *North-Picts*, which we may in general conclude of them both, when they were converted by such Persons who were Ministers of Churches that were governed by Bishops. The *South-Picts* by *Ninian* a *Britain*,^d who was himself a Bishop of *Candida Casa*, and (if the Author of his Life, cited by Archbishop *Usher*, is to be credited) consecrated

* *Bed. Hist.* l. 2. c. 19.

^d *Bed. Hist.* l. 3. c. 4.
Bishops,

Bishops, ordained Priests, and divided the Country into Parishes. The *North-Picts* by St. *Columba*, who came out of *Ireland*, and converted that Nation and their King *Bridius* from Gentilism, about the Year 560, and had the Isle of *Hy* bestowed on him, where he built his Monastery. This Person being a Disciple of *Finian* Bishop of *Meath*, and a Friend of *Columbanus* Bishop of *Laglin*, we may presume was a Friend to Episcopacy, tho' not ordained a Bishop, as other Converters of Nations were; probably out of a Love to a Monastick Life, which he not only continued in, but also eminently encouraged; as appears by the peculiar Priveleges which from his time the Abbots that were his Successors enjoyed. In this there being somewhat singular, which is thought to favour the Pretensions of the Presbyterians, and is insisted on as such by them, I shall particularly consider it.

The Sum thereof is this. After St. *Columba* had by his preaching and Example converted the *Picts*, the Isle of *Hy*, *Jona* or *Icolumkill*, was bestowed on him. In that Island he founded a Monastery: In order to raise it to the greater Reputation, the Abbats were invested with a peculiar Privilege, which was this, that tho' they were only in Priests Orders, they had a Jurisdiction not only over the Laity, but also by an unprecedented Singularity (*Ordine inusuato* as *Bede* expresses it) were superior to the Bishops of the Place; and that upon this Reason, because *Columba*, the first Missionary and Abbat, was no more than a Priest. But here, in order to excuse this, which was a flat Contradiction to the Practice of the Catholick Church, we are to consider; first, that this holy Abbat owned not only the Office of a Bishop, and its Distinction from that of a Presbyter, but also the Superiority of the Episcopal Order above that of a Presbyter, and that within his own Monastery: And this attested by *Adamnanus*, his Success-

* *Bed. Hist. l. 3. c. 4.*

for in that Abbey, which is as follows. 'A certain Bishop who had a mind to conceal himself, made *Columba* a Visit at *Hy*; and to make his Character the more unsuspected, was unusually submissive in his Behaviour. However, he was willing to pass for a Priest. When Sunday came, *St. Columba* desired him to assist in the Consecration of the Eucharist. When this Stranger came up to the Altar, being invited to break the *Holy Bread* with *S. Columba*, this Ceremony being the Custom of that Place, when two Priests were at Church together. The Stranger coming to the Altar upon this Occasion, *Columba* looking earnestly upon him, and discovering his Character, desired him to make use of the Privilege of his Order, and break the Bread alone. For, says he, "We know that you're a Bishop, why
" therefore have you endeavoured to conceal your
" self, and hinder us all from treating you with Re-
" spect and Veneration?" By this way of saluting the Bishop, 'tis plain *S. Columba* acknowledged the Episcopal Character to be superior to his own Order, which was no more than that of a Presbyter. But withal 'tis evident, that *Columba* acknowledged Bishops not only to be a distinct and superior Order, but likewise believed 'em necessary for perpetuating the Hierarchy, and ordaining others to the Functions of Priesthood, by his taking care to have always a Bishop resident upon his Monastery. Which shews that he thought that there was some Singularity of Privilege, some Branch of Power in the Episcopal Character, which exceeded the Commission of a Priest: And this distinguishing Prerogative it was, which made the Presence of a Bishop so necessary in that little Island. I would only add one thing farther in this place; and that is to desire those, who insist so much on the Example of this Monastery of *Hy*, in behalf of Presbyterian Government, to give us one

' Adamnan. *vis. Columb. l. i. 26.*

196 *An History of the Government*

Instance of this Abbat of *Hy* or his Monks ordaining any to the sacred Functions of the Ministry, or performing any other Act appropriate to the Office of a Bishop, tho' *Blondel* would have his Reader believe it by what ^s he cites out of *Bede*, concerning *Trumhere* and some other Bishops being ordained by the *Scots*: But comes not up to his Purpose, tho' he could withal have shewn that they had been ordained in the Isle or Monastery of *Hy*; in that a Bishop always resided there, as Archbishop *Usher* ^h has shewn out of the *Ulster Annals*; besides Bishop *Lloyd* tells us, that a Bishop of the Province is mention'd by *Bede*, whether the same with the Resident in the Monastery, or another, is uncertain. 'Tis also taken notice, that the Bishops of *Lindisfarn* were ordained by the *Scots*, because there was no other Bishop in the Kingdom of *Northumberland*; and hence in a Vacancy Application was made to the Bishops of *Scotland*.

I own that *Blondel* has told us something, and this as a Passage cited out of *Bede*, which, would his unwary credulous Reader take as such without Examination, would go far to prove that the Presbyters of *Hy* did take on them to ordain. This I shall fairly represent, that the Reader may make a Judgment of the Sincerity of this most learned Advocate of the Presbyterians. He tells us (in the Place fore-cited) " that *Cedda* was ordained Bishop of the *East Angles* by the *Scots*, a *Finano* scilicet *Lindisfarnensi* qui ab *Hyensibus* presbyteris ordinatus & missus fuerat, i. e. by *Finan* of *Lindisfarn*, who had been ordained and sent by the Presbyters of *Hy*. For which he cites *Bede's* History l. 3. c. 22. What is said of *Cedd* there, and of his Ordination is, " that when he " had preached the Gospel with Success, going " home, he came to the Church of *Lindisfarn*, that " he might discourse with *Finan* the Bishop, who,

^s *Blondel* *Apol.* p. 369.

^h *Usher.* de Primord. p. 701.

" when

“ when he found that the Work of the Gospel had
 “ had such good Success with him, made him Bi-
 “ shop of the *East Angles*, having called to him two
 “ other Bishops to join with him in that Office of
 “ ordaining him; who being advanced to be a Bi-
 “ shop, returned into his Province; where, being
 “ invested with greater Authority, he perfected the
 “ Work he had begun, erected Churches in several
 “ Places, and ordained Presbyters and Deacons, who
 “ might assist him in preaching the Word of Faith,
 “ and administering Baptism.” Let the Reader
 judge whether here’s any hint of what *Blondel* asserts,
 or any thing to the Advantage of the Presbyterian
 Cause; by the way, that Passage may help us to in-
 terpret that Phrase of *Bede*, of being *ordained by the*
Scots, which *Blondel* would willingly have his Reader
 understand to be meant of Ordination by *Presbyters*;
 but on what ground let the Reader judge by com-
 paring what *Bede* says of *Cedd*. l. 3. c. 25. who was,
 as he had told us before *jamdudum ordinatus a Scot-*
tis, long before *ordained by the Scots*, that is,
 by *Finan* and those two other Bishops who joined
 with him in ordaining him, who we must from
 hence conclude were *Scotch Bishops*. From whence
 we have a farther Proof, that the Church of *Scot-*
land was then governed by Bishops. But, because
 it may be suggested in *Blondel*’s Vindication, that
Finan’s Ordination by Presbyters may be delivered
 in some other Place of *Bede*, and that this was im-
 plied by *Blondel*’s putting that Line in another Cha-
 racter, by which a less cautious Reader might there-
 by be imposed upon; I shall relate what *Bede* tells
 us thereof, l. 3. cap. 17. “ *Finan* succeeded him
 “ (*Aidan*) in his Bishoprick, and he (*destinatus*)
 “ sent or appointed by *Hy*, that Isle and Monastery
 of the *Scots*. Where as the word [*destinatus*] sig-
 nifies only mission or appointing, and is exprest in
 King *Alfred*’s Saxon Translation only by *Com*, his
 coming from thence to his Episcopal Charge; so

198 *An History of the Government*

could it be wrested to signify Ordination, there's no Necessity it should have been done by the *Presbyter* or *Abbat* of *Hy*, as is asserted by *Blondel*; when they had a *Bishop*, and often more than one, among them in their Monastery, to perform Offices appropriate to Bishops.

So that as the Superiority of the *Abbat* of *Hy* above Bishops, tho' himself a *Presbyter*, is manifestly a Singularity unknown to former Ages in the Church, taken up when a Monastick Life came to be in great Vogue; so (abating for its Novelty) it makes nothing for the Adversaries of Episcopacy, in that these Abbats durst not assume the Power of Ordination, and other Offices which are proper to a Bishop. It was then at *Hy*, as 'tis now at *Oxford*, (by which Instance Bishop *Lloyd* illustrates it,) where a Bishop lives, and is as well known to be a Prelate of the English Church, as any other; and yet the Government is invested in the University, and its Chancellor and Vicechancellor, exclusive of the Bishop, and who have Precedence of him. And in *Christ's Church* the Bishop gives Place to his own Dean; notwithstanding which, if any Episcopal Act is to be performed, as the Consecration of a Chapel in the University; confirming, or conferring Holy Orders on any Members of the University; Recourse is had to the Bishop, and the Person ordained promises reverently to obey his Ordinary: And if he is promoted to a Parochial Cure in the Diocese, or in *Oxford* it self, he becomes subject to the Bishop, tho' he continues a Member of the University. Answerable to this was the Case of the Monastery of *Hy*, as it was of other Exempt Convents, after Monastery prevailed so much in the Church.

Before I leave the Isle of *Hy*, I would observe one thing for the sake of them who allow only Congregational Episcopacy; and that is, how large the Dioceses of those Bishops were, who were sent out of that Monastery, tho' we have no Ground to grant that

that they were ordained by Presbyters. Some were for the whole Kingdom of *Northumberland*, which took in all the Kingdom of *England* that lay North of *Humber*, and part of *Scotland*, as far as the *Frith* of *Edinburgh*; the Seat of which Bishops was first at *Lindisfarn*. Others, as *Diuma*, were Bishops of the *Middle-Angles* and *Mercians*, which comprehend a great many of our Midland Countiesⁱ. To omit observing how few Bishops there were in other Parts of *England* at that time.

Because the *Culdees*, tho' wholly Strangers to the Monastery of *Hy*, are (on no antienter Authority than that of *Hector Boethius*) hook'd in to give some Countenance to the pretended Government of the Church of *Scotland* by Presbyters without Bishops, and this even by *Blondel* himself; 'tis requisite that some Account should be given of them, to shew how little Service they do the Adversaries of Episcopacy.

First, 'tis observed by the learned Bishop *Lloyd*, that they are not mentioned by *Nennius*, who wrote in the Seventh, nor by *Bede*, who wrote in the Eighth Century; and the Word is not to be met with before the time of *Giraldus Cambrensis*, who lived in the Thirteenth Century. *Hector Boethius* is strangely extravagant in this Relation. He reports, "that in the time of the Emperors *Decius* and *Aurelian*, the *Scots* began to come over to Christianity; and that that they were assisted in their Conversion by certain Monks called *Culdees*, or *Cultores Dei*." First, the gross Folly of this Narration is plain, when the Rise of Monkery, even in the *Eastern* parts of Christendom, was not till some time after *Decius* and *Aurelian*, *St. Anthony* being the first of them who thus secluded themselves from the World; and that it was some time after, before it was brought into the *Western* Parts. Farther, as for the Etymology of the Name, *Cultores*

ⁱ *Bed. Hist.* l. 3. c. 21.

200 *An History of the Government*

Dei, 'tis ridiculous, when (as the forecited Prelate has shewn) 'tis purely of *British* Original. And then, we find none of this Distinction in *Scotland*, either at *Hy*, or in any other Place where those People, who are properly called *Scots*, antiently dwelt; but as often as they are mentioned, we find 'em at *St. Andrews*, which was in the Division of the *Southern Picts*, neither are they said to have been there, till the See of *Abernethy* was removed thither; about the Year 854. About a hundred Years after which, we are told, that *Constantine* quitted his Kingdom, and turned Abbat of the *Culdees*. About the Year 1108. when *Turgot* Prior of *Durham* was made Bishop of *St. Andrews*, they are again mentioned. About which time, the Bishop of *Worcester* is of Opinion, they were Dean and Chapter, and had a Right of confirming all the Bishops of *Scotland*; which Privilege he conjectures might belong to 'em upon the score of the Primacy of the See of *St. Andrews*. The last Mention of them is in a Contest in the Choice of a Bishop of *St. Andrews* in the Year 1292, in opposition to *Lamberton*, wherein they opposed the *Canons* of that Church, and appealed to the Pope, but without Remedy. From which time 'tis probable they lost their Right of electing the Archbishop of that See, which they had formerly enjoyed. This is the Sum of what is delivered to us of these *Culdees* in *Scotland*, omitting what is said of 'em in *Ireland*; or elsewhere; but they are no where, in any ancient Author, mentioned as Governors of the Church, or invested with that Authority, which Bishops challenge as appropriate to their Office, such as the Power of Ordaining, &c. And hence of no Service to the Presbyterians.

C H A P. XIII.

Of Chorepiscopi and Περιοδῶται.

I Might well omit to treat of *Chorepiscopi*, when they do the Adversaries of Episcopacy no real Service, and especially when there is no mention of them before the Councils of *Ancyra* and *Neocæsarea*, *A. D.* 314. and therefore scarce within the time I prefixed of my writing the History of the Government of the Church. *Blondel* himself (p. 95.) says, that the *Chorepiscopi* were not known by Name before that time; tho' (p. 93.) he insinuates, as if *St. Clement* in his Epistle had meant them by Bishops κτ' χωρεας, which I have already considered, *Chap. V.* But that I may not be wanting to my Readers Expectation, I will consider this Office; and this the rather, in that hereby I shall have an Opportunity of obliging learned Persons with an Explanation of the Canons of *Ancyra* and *Neocæsarea* concerning the *Chorepiscopi*, which my learned Friend *Mr. Dodwell* was pleased to communicate to me for the Service of the Publick: Which cannot but be acceptable, when the Sense and Reading of them has afforded Matter of Dispute to learned Persons, with whose Debates I will not trouble the Reader (together with some Observations, which he has furnished me with in this Disquisition.)

The Thirteenth Canon of the Council of *Ancyra* is as follows, Χωρεπισκόποις μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ δε ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΥΣ πόλειως χωρὶς τῆ ἐπιτροπῆς καὶ τῆ ἐπισκόπου μτ' γραμμάτων ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ. *Blondel* frequently, and sometimes justly, blames others for their Translations, but here translates this with others (because, if admitted, it might do some Service to the Presbyterian Cause) *Sed nec Presbyteris—permittatur,*

tur, &c. where he renders *πρεσβυτέρως* a Word of the Accusative Case by *Presbyteris* in the Dative : And this, tho' he pretends not that the Greek is otherwise in any MS. or other Editions, but *πρεσβυτέρως*. Tho' it must be owned, that he handles the Case of the *Chorepiscopi* for the most part fairly and without Prejudice. Now retaining this Reading, it may be thus translated, or justly paraphrased : *It is not lawful for the Chorepiscopi to ordain Presbyters or Deacons, [no,] not even the Presbyters of a City [or χωμόπολις] in an other District [or in that of another Chorepiscopus] without the Permission of the Bishop [i. e. of the Bishop of the City, in whose Jurisdiction both the Chorepiscopi are, attested] by his Letters.* There's nothing in this Interpretation, but what will be consonant with the Words of the Canon, and the Constitutions of the Church ; if we consider, that as there were *Πόλεις*, Cities, such as had a large Extent, and had Regions under them ; so there were lesser Cities, usually styled *χωμοπόλεις*, which, tho' under the Jurisdiction of larger Cities, were above Villages, had their own *παργικίαν* or particular District, enjoyed particular Privileges, and much resembled our Corporations. In the 13th *Action* of the Council of *Chalcedon*, there was a Dispute betwixt the Bishops of *Nicomedia* and *Nice*, to which of their Jurisdictions the City of *Basilinopolis* belonged. *Anastasius* Bishop of *Nice* pleaded, that it belonged to himself, in that it was a *Region* of the City of *Nice* : And to make this out, argued, that as *Tattains* and *Doris* were Regions under *Nice*, so was likewise *Basilinopolis*, which either *Julian* or some other made a *City*, and that it received *πραγματώμενον* a *Curialis* from *Nice*. Καὶ ἡ πρότερον ἔσα *ῤεγεών*, πάλιν μὲν ταῦτα ἐγένετο πόλις, " That which " formerly was a *Regio* (the *Latin* word for *χώρα*) " afterwards became a *City*. This happened by the Kindness of *Julian*, or some other Emperor : As on the contrary, some other Places have lost their

their City-Privileges through the Displeasure of some Emperor; as *Byzantium* for some time did thro' the Displeasure of *Severus*, whom it had opposed in behalf of *Niger* and was made subject to *Perinthius*. So that here we have a plain Distinction betwixt *Cities*, and *Regions*, called by the *Greeks* *χώραι*.

In the first of those, that is, *Cities* properly so called, Bishops were placed; and not in the latter, *ne vilesceret nomen Episcopi*, (as the Fathers express it ^b) lest the Office of a Bishop should become cheap and contemptible. Yet when afterwards the Number of Christians increased, and thence *Dioceses*, in respect to the Persons in it, were enlarged; it was found convenient not only to place *Presbyters* in Towns and Villages, as *Gaius* at *Didda* who was *πρεσβύτερος ἐμχώρου*, (of which before) but also to settle *Bishops* in lesser *Cities* called usually *Regiones* who should be subject to the Bishop of that large City, to which these were subordinate, to ease him, and be assistant to him in several Cases, (which will presently be considered;) him, who in this Canon is called *Επίσκοπος* Bishop; whose Permission was, in the Case there mentioned, to be obtained. As the Towns or *χώραι*, in which these inferior Bishops were placed, had their *παροικίαν*, their proper Region and District; so had these Bishops, who are styled *Chorepiscopi* from the *χώρη* in which they were settled. And when 'tis probable that in large *Dioceses* there might be several of these *Chorepiscopi* or *Regionary* Bishops, each having his *παροικίαν* or District; this Canon of *Ancyra* forbids a *Chorepiscopus*, even in the District of one of his Fellow *Chorepiscopi* to ordain a *Presbyter* of

^b In the Council of Serdica, which forbids placing Bishops in *modicâ civitate*, on this Reason, viz. *ne vilescat nomen Episcopi & autoritas*.

that

204 *An History of the Government*

that City or *χωμόπολις* wherein that *Chorepiscopus* had his Station, without a particular Commission from the Bishop.

Tho' withal, *παροικία* may be taken in its ordinary Signification for the Diocese of a Diocesan Bishop; And then the Sense of the Canon will be this; "That no *Chorepiscopus* should ordain
" *Presbyters* or *Deacons*; but especial Care should
" be taken that they ordain not any *Presbyters* of
" a City in any other Bishop's District, without par-
" ticular Leave granted by the Bishop of that Di-
" strict attested by his Letters." We have no Hi-
story of the Actings of the *Chorepiscopi*, and so can only guess at the Reason of the Decree: But 'tis probable that these Regionary Bishops had transcended their Bounds, and that so far, as even to ordain *Presbyters* of Cities in other Bishop's Districts without their Leave, and that hence this Council thought themselves obliged to take notice thereof, and restrain them. Possibly they might be the bolder thus to act, if they were only under the Jurisdiction of Metropolitans, which Mr. *Dodwell* was ready to conceive of them, because in their Subscriptions in Councils (of which presently) they are ranked only among the Bishops of such a Province, and not of any one particular Diocese or Region. As in the Council of *Nice* among the Bishops of the Province of *Isauria*, when other Bishops add the Name of the City over which they presided to their own Names, these only set their Names adding thereto *Chorepiscopus*, as *Palladius Chorepiscopus*, and others accordingly.

The Canon of the Council of *Neocæsarea* assembled likewise *A.D.* 314, by inserting of one word, will be clear, which otherwise is obscure and unintelligible.

Επιχώριοι πρεσβύτεροι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ τῇ πόλεως προσ-
φέρειν ἔδωκαν, παρόντι ἐπισκόπῳ ἢ πρεσβυτέρῳ
πόλεως. ἕτε μὴ ἄξιον δίδοναι ἐκ ἐυχῆς, ἕτε πόλιν.
Ἐάν τῳ ἄπῳσι καὶ [χωρεπίσκοπος] εἰς ἐυχὴν κληθῇ μόνῳ,
δίδωσιν.

δίδωσιν. Οἱ δὲ χωρεπίσκοποι εἰσὶ μὲν εἰς τύπον τῆς ἐκδο-
μῆκοντα, ὡς δὲ συλλειτουργοὶ ὅλῃ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ εἰς τὰς πόλεις.
χρὲς προσφέρουσι τιμώμενοι. *The Regionary Presbyters*
may not make the Oblation in the City-Church, when the
Bishop is present, and the City-Presbyters; neither give
the Bread in Prayer [or in the time of the Eucharisti-
cal Office] nor yet the Cup. But if they be absent, and
the Chorepiscopus alone called to Prayers [or to ce-
lebrate the Office at the θυσιαστήριον] he may give
[them.] For the Chorepiscopi are in resemblance of
the Seventy, as they are Assistants in the sacerdotal Of-
fice [to the Bishop] and are honoured because of their
Care in offering the Oblations [designed] for the use of
the Poor. As it is read εἰς ἀπώσι, which is Plural,
and then κληθῆ μόνῳ, which is Singular, it is neither
good Grammar, nor good Sense; neither is the Con-
nection with the following Sentence evident. But by
inserting χωρεπίσκοπῳ, all is clear, plain and easy.
For the justifying of which Reading, we have the
Authority of an old Latin Version given us by Justel-
lus, which in the latter Part of the first Sentence runs
thus, Si autem absentes sint, & in oratione vocatus fue-
rit qui de eo loco est Chorepiscopus, solus dat. This Ca-
non helps to give us the reason of the Institution of
the Chorepiscopi, and the Nature of their Office.
They were to be Assistants to the Bishop, as the se-
venty Elders were to Moses, to help him in the Dis-
charge of his Duty, when he had a great People, a
large Flock committed to his Care. And as the End,
so the Nature of the Office is hereby shewn to us.
We find Num. 11. 25. that God took of the Spirit that
was upon Moses, and gave it to the seventy Elders:
The same Spirit which Moses had, was conferred on
them, and thence they were of the same Office with
Moses, tho' they acted in Subordination to him. So
were the Chorepiscopi of the same Office with other
Bishops, and invested with the same Episcopal Au-
thority, but restrained in the Exercise of it, and
acted in Subordination to that Bishop in whose Dio-
cese

cese their Region was. One Branch of their Office was, εἰς τὰς πτωχάς, that as one Part of the Bishop's Office was to receive the Oblations, and to distribute some Portion thereof to the Poor, (See Mr. *Dodwell's Parænesis* §. 30.) so it was one Part of the Office of the *Chorepiscopus* to assist the Bishop in the Oblation, if called, and in this Distribution, probably in that Part of the Diocese which was his Region. Another thing was to assist him in going on ecclesiastical Messages, and particularly to Councils, (of which more presently) when he could not go in Person.

The next that mentions the *Chorepiscopi* is the Council of *Antioch* in *Syria*, assembled *A. D.* 341. which in Canon the Eighth, forbids Country Presbyters to send κανονικάς [possibly κοινωνικάς] ἐπιστολάς communicatory Letters even to their Neighbour Bishops, but permits the *Chorepiscopi* who were unreprouable διδόναι εἰρησυχικάς, to send *Pacificatory* Letters.

Where we find the *Chorepiscopi* to be of an higher Office than that of Presbyters, and invested with the Privilege of sending *Literas formatas* to other Bishops, which was in those Ages peculiar to Bishops, as has been shewn *Chap. X.*

The tenth Canon of the same Council do's likewise concern the "*Chorepiscopi*, who, tho' they were
 " ordained Bishops, yet the Council requires
 " them to observe their own Bounds, to minister in
 " the Churches that are subject to 'em, to rest satisfied with the Care intrusted to 'em, to ordain
 " Readers, Subdeacons and Exorcists, and to content themselves with the Advancement of these,
 " but that they should not dare to ordain either
 " Presbyter or Deacon without leave of the Bishop
 " of the City to whom both he himself and his Region are subject. That if any one transgressed
 " what is here decreed, he should be deprived of the
 " Honour he enjoyed. Lastly, that the *Chorepiscopus*
 " should be under the Bishop of that City to which
 " he was subject.

St. Ba-

St. Basil's 181st Epistle is written to the *Chorepiscopi*, wherein he complains of the Licentiousness of the Clergy at that time, and gives this as one Reason thereof, the want of Care in those Persons, who by their Office were obliged to it, diligently to enquire into the Lives and Deameanor of them who were to be ordained into the sacred Ministry. This the Presbyters and Deacons who dwelt with them, had opportunity to enquire after, and to acquaint the *Chorepiscopi* therewith, who having received those Suffrages or Testimonials faithfully given in, and the Bishops Licence, took these into the Number of those who ministred in the sacerdotal Office. This St. Basil shews had been the Practice of the Church, when its Discipline was observed; but sadly complains that *then* it was otherwise, that Presbyters were remiss in their Enquiries, recommended unworthy Persons from some Favour or Relation they had to 'em, and that the *Chorepiscopi* permitted this, and ordained these without a due Care in their Enquiries into the Suffrages that were given in; and withal tells them that they did this (*εἰς ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ὅλως ὑπερησάτε αὐθεντίαν*) wholly by their own Authority, without ever consulting him [their Bishop.] And afterwards requires of them that they should send him a List (of which they were to keep a Duplicate) of all the Ministers of each Village, by whom each of them was brought in [or ordained] and an Account of their Lives.

Besides what has been produced, we find farther mention of *Chorepiscopi* (observed by Blondel p. 131.) and that they subscribed, as *definientes*, to the Decrees of Councils; and this not only as Proxies for other Bishops (for so Presbyters and Deacons did) For in the sixth *Action* of the Council of Chalcedon, *Sophronius* did for *Bassianus* Bishop of *Mopsuestia*, *Adelphius* for *Adolius* Bishop of *Arabissum*, *Daditus* for *Messalinus* Bishop of *Laodicea*, and *Euelpistus* for *Florentius* Bishop of *Lesbos*. But also some subscri-
bing

bing in their own Name, and by their own Authority, and this as early as we find any mention of them; as in the Council of *Neocæsarea*, *Stephanus* and *Rhodon* or *Rhudon*, Chorepiscopi of *Cappadocia*: After in that of *Nice*, no fewer than fourteen, of *Syrians* two, of *Cappadocians* five, of *Isaurians* one, of *Pamphylians*, *Lycaonians*, *Bythinians*, of each two. As afterwards in the Council of *Ephesus*, *Cæsarius*, Chorepiscopus of *Alce* subscribed to the Condemnation of *Nestorius*. This is a farther Confirmation that these *Chorepiscopi* were truly Bishops, seeing that in those early Ages, tho' Presbyters and Deacons might be present in Councils, and act as Proxies for Bishops; yet none but Bishops had, in themselves, or from their own Office, Authority to pass Decrees in Councils.

These are the chief Instances we have wherein *Chorepiscopi* are first mentioned, 'till the Council of *Laodicea* forbad the making any more, of which presently. By all which we may make a Judgment of the Nature of the Office, the End, and partly the time of its Institution, and also the Countries and Places where they were used. The Office evidently appears to be Episcopal; that they were truly Bishops in their first Institution (and not Presbyters, as some learned Men have supposed) in that we find them in Councils, and their subscribing in their own Names, as *definientes*; when they had Power of sending *litteras formatas*, communicatory Letters to other Bishops, which was a peculiar Prerogative of Bishops; and above all, when they had the Power of *Ordination*. Their Power to ordain Subdeacons, Lectors and the lower Orders, is never questioned, and this (so far as appears) without particular Licence from the Bishop of the City to whom they were subject. And tho' they were ordinarily restrained from ordaining Presbyters and Deacons, yet this they might do in some Cases with the City-Bishop's Permission, attested by his Letters. Tho' they were Bishops, yet not

not placed in Cities, as originally Bishops were, but in a *χωρη* or Region, which tho' it had its particular Privileges, was dependent on a City; and hence they acted not as supreme Governours even in their own District, but with Dependence on, and Subordination to the Bishop of that City, in whose Jurisdiction that Region was: And here they were placed to be Assistants to the City-Bishops, that where the Diocese was large, they might perform some Episcopal Acts, (such as those before mentioned, and visiting part of his Flock) which the Bishop could not do conveniently, by reason of the Distance of those Places from the City which he governed, and where he usually resided. They received Testimonials of such who were Candidates to the sacred Ministry, and imparted these to the City Bishop. In these and the like respects they were helpful to the City Bishop, as the *Seventy* were to *Moses*, and in all likelihood were on this Reason instituted in the *Eastern Churches*, for we hear nothing of them in the *Western Churches* (as *Blondel* observes) till the Council of *Riez*, *A. D.* 439. and there only as the Name was permitted to be given as an honorary Title to *Armentarius*, who had been uncanonically consecrated. Besides this, we find nothing in the *Gallican Churches*, and nothing at all in the *African, Spanish, or other Churches* in the West, till about the eighth Century: Who, whether they were the same Office, as the first *Chorepiscopi*, or only Presbyters, I leave to learned Persons to determine, this not concerning that Age, which I propounded to consider.

No doubt but great Conveniences were propounded by them, who first instituted this Office; but it was found afterwards that Inconveniences attended it, occasioned by the *Chorepiscopi* transcending their Bounds. From whence it was that some Councils (as we have seen) set Limits to them, and restrained them in the Exercise of their Power, and at last the

Council of *Laodicea* laid them aside. Tho' that Decree seems not to have been then universally received, in that *St. Basil's* Epistle to the *Chorepiscopi* was probably written after that time; in which, tho' he blames them for their Remissness in the Discharge of their Office, yet says nothing of its Abolishment; and withal we find them afterwards in the Council of *Chalcedon*, tho' not acting up to their superior Character, as they had done in former Councils.

The Decree of the Council of *Laodicea* of *Phrygia*, assembled *A. D.* 363. (according to *Blondel*) is this, That they ought not to appoint Bishops in Villages, and ἐν χωρίοις in Regions, [Country Towns less than Cities] but ἐπεποδῶτας, Itinerants: And that those who had before been appointed [or constituted there] should act nothing without the Consent of the City Bishop, In which, as it was decreed, that no more of these regionary Bishops should be ordained, so those who were in that Office are not deposed, but only restrained from acting without the Bishop's Licence, and probably then reduced into the Rank of the ἐπεποδῶται, whom the Latins translate *Visitatores*. An Office, which we shall presently see was executed by Presbyters, which likewise the *Chorepiscopi* that then were, (after new ones were forbidden to be ordained) continued to act as ἐπεποδῶται, which they before performed under their former Character. They continuing still to be Assistants to their Bishops, tho' in a less honourable Station. Hence in the Council of *Chalcedon* there were several of them present, but they did not subscribe in their own Names, as formerly they had done, but in the Name of the Bishops who sent them thither, and commissioned them to act there as their Substitutes.

This leads me to consider what this Office of ἐπεποδῶτης or *Itinerant* was. The Council of *Laodicea*, no doubt from some Inconvenience they had experienc'd of *Chorepiscopi*, decreed that afterwards no more should be made; yet when they found it requi-

site, that in large Dioceses there ought still to be some, who might be Assistants to the Bishops, especially in Places which were far from their Residence, as the *Chorepiscopi* had been designed; they pitched upon these *Itinerants*.

This does not imply that this was a new Office, never before used in the Christian Church; but that it was now again revived, and brought into a more frequent use upon this Occasion.

We find St. Paul 2 Cor. 8. 23. speaking of some who were ἀποστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, which we render *Messengers of the Churches*; and v. 19. of that Brother, who was chosen of the Churches to travel with us. And in the next Age, immediately after the times of the Apostles, we find Persons sent from several Churches to the holy Martyr *Ignatius*, to testify the Honour they had deservedly for him; and these not only Presbyters and Deacons, but even Bishops; as *Polybius* from the Church of *Trallis*, *Onesimus* from *Ephesus*, *Damas* from the *Magnesians*, of which Churches they were Bishops. But withal S. *Ignatius*, upon his hearing that the Persecution was ceased in the Church of *Antioch* in *Syria*, his dearly beloved Flock, for which in several of his Epistles he expresses a most affectionate Concern) tells the *Philadelphians* (ch. 10.) that it would become them, as they were a Church of God, to ordain a Deacon εἰς τὸ πρεσβεῖσαι ἐκείνῃ θείῃ πρεσβείᾳ to be an Ambassador [at *Antioch*] to rejoice with them, and to congratulate their present State. To move them hereunto, he tells them that other Churches had sent Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons on the same Errand. And in his Epistle to the *Smyrneans*, he desires them to send one to the same Church on the same Message, whom he names θεοπρεσβύτῳ, (for so Bishop *Pearson* in his Annotations shews it ought to be read, and the *Interpolate* Epistle retains that Reading, and Dr. *Smith*, in his late Edition, tho' in *Vossius's* Edition, which the old Version seems to countenance, 'tis θεοπρεσβύ-
τῳ)

τῶν) And St. Polycarp in his Epistle to the *Philippians* n. 13. uses the like Expression of one whom he intended to send to the same Church, in his own Name, and in that of the *Philippians*, ὃν πέμψω πρεσβύτην καὶ πρεσβυτέρους. Another Name is given to the same Office, whom *Ignatius* in his Epistle to *Polycarp* n. 7. desires might be sent to *Antioch* on the forementioned Message, and that is ἐκδοχέμενος, for so he says a Messenger, set apart for that purpose may well be called. This latter (as my forecited honoured Friend probably conjectures) in Allusion to the *Curfus publicus*, which was erected to maintain a Correspondence of one part of the *Roman Empire* with the other, especially with the Emperor's *Castra* or Court, to impart the Affairs of each Province thither, and to receive Orders from thence, with all Expedition: And the former, the ἐκδοχέμενος, in Allusion to *Legates* employed on Messages, or presenting Petitions to the Emperor; whence the excellent Apology of *Athenagoras* in behalf of the Christians, is styled πρεσβεία, as was that of *Philo* in behalf of the *Jews*. As the *Cursores* and *Legati* were employed in secular Affairs, so were the ecclesiastical Messengers, who were thence styled ἐκδοχέμενοι and ἐκδοχέμενοι, employed in Affairs of God's Church; such as informing each other of the Death of their Bishops, and who succeeded them; what the present State of their Church was, sometimes as infested with Persecutions from without, and sometimes (which they more lamented) with Heresies and Schisms from within; in the first, with the Courage of Martyrs in their Sufferings, and the sad Falls of others; also their Expressions of Sorrow for the Breaches and Calamities that beset their neighbour Churches, and their affectionate Congratulations for their Peace and Happiness; and many other things which might tend to their mutual Benefit, and to the Honour of their Great Sovereign, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.

We

We find in those first Ages of the Church (as is evident from S. Cyprian's Epistles, to name no other) what frequent Need there was of such Messengers, (who were, so far as I can observe, generally Clergy-Men,) to keep up an Intercourse and Correspondence betwixt Churches on the Accounts before named. Now these Officers having been long in the Church, the Council of *Laodicea*, when it decreed that no more *Chorepiscopi* should be ordained, and yet found it requisite that Bishops, especially those who had large Districts, should have some to assist them, they pitched upon these *ἐπισκοπῶνται* for this End. And because one of their chief Employments was *Visiting* that Part of the Diocese which was farthest off from the Bishop's Residence, the *Latins* called them *Visitatores*; they therein much resembling the present Archdeacons of our Church; tho' not so confined to that, as not to be employed by the Bishop in other Affairs of the Church, as there was Occasion. Hence in the fourth Action of the Council of *Chalcedon*, there is mention of one *Alexander*, who is styled both *Presbyter* and *ἐπισκοπῶντης*, who was sent by the Council to the Emperor, to represent the Case of *Carosus* and *Dorotheus*. And in *Action* the tenth of the same Council, we find the Petition of *Samuel* and other Presbyters of the Church of *Edeffa* repeated, which they had before in the Council of *Berytus* presented against their Bishop *Ibas*; where, among other Crimes, they accuse him for ordaining one *Valentius* (a very bad Man) *ἐπισκοπῶντος καὶ ἐπισκοπῶντος*, a Presbyter and Itinerant; by which we find this Office, so long at least, continued in the Church.

Thus I have endeavoured to shew what the Office of the *Chorepiscopi* was, from the first Accounts we have of them; and cannot, upon my Reflections thereon, find what Advantage the Adversaries of Episcopacy can make thereof. Had there been any just Ground to judge them to have been Presbyters, then indeed their Power of ordaining would have

been of Service to our Adversaries; but *Blondel* himself owns that they were Bishops, and has given us sufficient Reasons for his asserting it.

Neither can I discern what Service the *Chorepiscopi* do to the Enemies of Diocesan Bishops, to them who confine a Bishop to a single Congregation. If the Bishops of large Dioceses found it convenient to place these Regionary Bishops in those Parts of their Districts which were at a considerable Distance from their City, to visit that Part of their Flock, and to perform some Episcopal Acts (which they in their own Persons could not conveniently perform) but still in Subordination to themselves; doth this shew that Diocesan Bishops are not Apostolical, nay, that they are so far from that, that they are Criminal? Especially, when from all the Accounts we have of these Regionary Bishops, 'tis evident they were subject to the City Bishop, and could act nothing of any moment without his Approbation, the Right of governing the Church residing in him. Could they have shewn that it was the constant Practice of the Church, that instead of appointing these Officers as subordinate and assistant to the Bishop, they ordinarily divided their Dioceses, when enlarged by Addition of Converts, into several Districts, these not exceeding single Congregations, and that over each of these they did appoint a Bishop with supreme governing Power; this indeed would have been serviceable to their Cause. But this is not the Case of the *Chorepiscopi*, nor can they prove that this was done. 'Tis true, we find sometimes new Bishopricks erected, and Dioceses divided. The Donatists placed Bishops in some Places where there were none before, to strengthen their Party, and the Catholicks did the like in opposition to them; and both Sides upbraided each other therewith. *St. Augustin*, set a Bishop at *Fussala*, a Garrison-Town (*Castellum*) that belonged to his own Diocese, because it was at the Distance of forty Miles from *Hippo*; but afterwards found the
Incon-

Inconvenience of this Division, and was forced to take it again into his own Care. By the way observe, the admirably pious Bishop St. *Augustin*, had a place 40 Miles distant from him under his *Episcopal* Care. Before that St. *Basil* placed the famous *Gregory Nazianzen* Bishop at *Sasima*, a City that was before in the District of the Bishop of *Casarea* in *Cappadocia*; which tho' a small City, our Adversaries cannot shew that the Christians therein exceeded not a single Congregation. So likewise when some Places have by the secular Power been dignified with the Name and Privilege of Cities, they have been by the ecclesiastical Power made Bishops Sees. Thus in *Basilinopolis*, after it had been made a City, S. *Chrysostom* placed *Alexander* as its Bishop; as *Synefius* (*Ep.* 66.) tells *Theophilus* his Metropolitan, when he desires his Advice about him.ⁱ But this reaches not the Case of the *Chorepiscopi*, nor shews that even the Regions where they were placed, had no more than one Congregation in them; when *Basilinopolis*, which was at first but a Region, was so considerable as to be made a City. Nor doth it appear that these new erected Bishopricks were so small, as to have in them but only one Congregation; especially when the neighbouring Villages belonged to 'em, over which they can never shew that any Bishop was placed; no more than that *Oxford*, *Bristol*, *Peterborow*, &c. are such, because that King *Henry* the Eighth made these Bishops Sees, which were taken out of their Dioceses.

When therefore from the beginning, Christians of one City, tho' never so numerous, were but one Church, and so numerous as that it was impossible to assemble for divine Worship in one Congregation, and yet were always under one Bishop, tho' having many Presbyters officiating under him; and that when Dioceses were, by the Accession of many Chri-

ⁱ And we find one *Gerontius* Bishop of *Basilinopolis* subscribing in the Council of *Chalcedon*.

stian Converts enlarged, and yet not ordinarily divided into lesser Districts; and if on some prudential Considerations this was done, that these Districts exceeded not a single Congregation, which as yet has never been shewn by our Adversaries, and I am confident cannot be shewn: I earnestly intreat them, as they value the Honour of Almighty God, the Peace of his Church, the inward Peace of their own Consciences; that they would not any longer delude ignorant, tho' well-meaning Persons, with such Fancies; and thereby hinder them from uniting with their Bishop's Communion, to the Hindrance of their present spiritual Benefit, and their future eternal Happiness, as well as to the Disturbance of the Church's and Kingdom's Peace and Tranquillity.

C H A P. XIV.

St. Jerom's Opinion of the Introduction of Bishops considered: What Pseudo-Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, &c. say in this Cause: Also the Custom of naming a Bishop at Alexandria.

MY great End in this Undertaking being to undeceive Persons who are prejudiced against the Government of the Church of *England*, I conceived nothing could better conduce thereto, than to give them a plain Narrative, how our Saviour, by whom the Church was founded, instituted a Subordination of Ministers, viz. the twelve Apostles of a superior Rank, and the seventy Disciples of a lower Order; how the Apostles acted conformably thereto, by placing Presbyters in Churches, to baptize,

tize, teach and perform other the like Ministries, but kept the Government in their own Hands, and executed Censures by their own Authority: How a little before their Deaths they settled Bishops to govern particular Churches; as appears from the *Angels* of the Churches of *Asia*, and other Instances: And all Accounts we have of the Government of the Church in the times immediately after the Apostles, and in all Ages since, shew that the Church was every where governed by Bishops, a superior Office to that of Presbyters, 'till the Alteration was made at *Geneva*: All which evinces that this Government is of divine Institution. Yet lest any thing should be wanting towards the Conviction of its Adversaries, I am willing to consider every thing that I could foresee might be objected against what I have written, especially Matters of Fact, which seem to invalidate this Account, and are urged by our Adversaries to this Purpose.

The chief that I shall consider is the famous Passage of *St. Jerom* in his Commentary on *Tit.* 1. In defence of which the great Champion of Presbytery *D. Blondel* has shewn himself a learned Person by the Abundance of Citations he has given us, but in the mean while a weak Advocate, when his Heap of Quotations are in reality of so little Service to the Cause he espoused, as has been in many Particulars shewn by his learned Adversaries.

The Passage of *St. Jerom* is as follows. “ Before that Contentions in Religion thro’ the Devil’s Suggestion arose, and that it was said among the People, I am of *Paul*, and I am of *Apollos*, and I

* *Antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephæ, communi Presbyterorum concilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur. Postquam verò unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat suos putabat esse, non Christi: in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris, ad quem omnis ecclesiæ cura pertineret, ut Schismatum semina tollerentur. Hieronym. Comment. in Tit. c. 1.*

“ of

218 *An History of the Government*

“ of *Cephas*, Churches were governed by a Common
 “ Council of Presbyters. But afterwards, when eve-
 “ ry one accounted him whom he had baptized as
 “ his own [Disciple] and not as Christ’s, it was de-
 “ creed in the whole World, that one chosen from
 “ among the Presbyters should be placed over the
 “ rest, to whom the Care of the Church should ap-
 “ pertain, that hereby the Seeds of Schism might be
 “ taken away.” These Words will admit of such
 a Sense as will do no Disservice to the Cause of Epif-
 copacy, if we expound them of that Time, and of
 those Contentions which were in the Church of *Co-*
rinth, when it was said, *I am of Paul, and I of Apol-*
los, &c. for which *St. Paul* taxes the Schismatics of
 that Church: That the Apostles, when they discer-
 ned the Inconvenience of having the Church gover-
 ned by a Community of Presbyters, in that hereby
 Factions did, and would arise among them, which
 in such a State would not be easily composed; did
 decree, that each Church should be governed by a
 single Person, a Bishop, who should be chosen out
 of the Presbyters, and set over them, as theirs and
 the whole Churches Governor. To confirm which
 Exposition, (1) It cannot be denied that these Divi-
 sions, which *St. Jerom* mentions, when one said *I am*
of Paul, &c. happened in the times of the Apostles.
 When (2) *St. Jerom* himself, in other places of his
 Works, mentions *St. James*, *St. Mark*, and his Suc-
 cessor *Anianus*, *Clemens*, *Ignatius*, &c. as Bishops
 either in the times of the Apostles, or immediately
 after their Death, as we shall see presently.

If any object (as *Blondel* doth) that this sense of
S. Jerom’s words cannot easily be reconciled with the
 Time when that Epistle to the *Corinthians* was writ-
 ten, and so *S. Jerom* is not consistent with himself:
 The like inconsistency (which I have just now obser-
 ved) is he guilty of, if otherwise understood. And
 it cannot be denied, but that this learned Father, e-
 specially when he wrote in a Heat, was guilty of
 Inconsistencies. But

But omitting that, I'll consider St. *Jerom's* Words in the Sense that *Blondel* and others give of them: viz. " That the Church was at first (*i. e.* by the " Apostles) committed to a common Council of " Presbyters to be governed by them; that this go- " vernment continued for about 35 or 40 Years af- " ter the Death of the Apostles; that about that " time, there arose such Heats and Schisms in the " Church (occasioned by that Government, or at " least such as that Government was not able to pre- " vent or compose) that presently a Decree was " made, to which the Christians throughout the " whole World agreed, that the Church should no " longer be governed by a Community of Presbyters, " but by a single Person, a Bishop, who should be " elected out of the Presbyters, and set over them; " that hereby all Occasions of Schisms might be pre- " vented, and the Church enjoy Peace and Tran- " quillity." And from the Supposition of such a Fact, they conclude, that the Government by a Communi- ty of Presbyters, which (as they suppose) was in- stituted by the Apostles, came to be changed, and the Government by Bishops introduced thro' the whole World; and that this Change was made about 35 or 40 Years after the Apostles. Thus they in- terpret St. *Jerom's* Words, and in this Sense I shall take them, and consider on what Foundation this Matter of Fact is builded, and of what Service it is for the overthrowing of the Episcopal, and the introducing of the Presbyterian Government in its stead.

I. Let us consider on what Occasion this was writ- ten by St. *Jerom*; 'tis probable on the same as his Epistle to *Evagrius*, to oppose the Arrogance of the Deacons in the Church of *Rome*, who, because they were entrusted with the Treasure of the Church, which gave them Respect with the People, deemed themselves, if not superior to, yet at least equal with, the Presbyters. To oppose which insolent and haugh-
ty

ty Demeanor of the Deacons towards the Presbyters, he shews, that whereas the Deacons were but as Servants to the Church, the Presbyters participated of the same Priesthood with the Bishop, (tho' even in that, in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, he excepts the Power of Ordination); and brings this as an Evidence of the Dignity of Presbyters, that at first the Government of the Church was entrusted to them, 'till altered by the Decree he mentions. Whether this did not fall from him without due Consideration from that natural Warmth wherewith he used to prosecute Causes which he had espoused, I leave others to judge, being unwilling to expose the Nakedness of this learned Father. His Failings are too fully represented by Mr. *Daille* [in his Use of the Fathers,] in order to disparage their Authority; tho' his Testimony in this Case is so much urged by that learned Person and others, in opposition to Episcopacy, as to make the Sense of the whole Church to depend on his single Authority. But on what a slender Foundation it stands, will appear by considering

2. That this pretended Matter of Fact, the enacting such a Decree, is supposed to be long before the time of *St. Jerom*, viz. near 300 Years, and consequently such of which he himself can be no competent Witness: Nor can his Assertion be of any Validity, unless he had produced Records, or the Testimony of others who lived at, or near the time of that pretended Change of Church Government, to confirm it; which he has not done, tho' we have some eminent Writers of that Time, Nay, this is so far from being true, that it is inconsistent with, nay contrary to, all the Accounts which have been transmitted down from that time, and the following Ages; as appears from the foregoing History, and the Succession of Bishops in so many eminent Cities from the time of the Apostles: Which fully evidences the Establishment of Bishops in the Church, before

fore that supposed Change of its Government, which will presently appear more fully.

3. Especially, when he acquaints us not with the Circumstances that are requisite to be known in an Affair of so great moment, in which all the World are concerned, and are supposed to acquiesce, and to comply. He tells us not the Place where this Decree was made, nor the Persons who met to enact it, nor who he was who presided in this Synod, nor the means whereby it was transmitted to all Churches thro' the Universe. He tells us not how they came so contentedly to submit to, and embrace this pretended new Government, when 'twas contrary to that to which they had been accustomed, and which they are supposed to have received from the Apostles themselves, and thence by divine Direction. We are left at a loss likewise to know, what Reasons the Presbyters had so tamely and quietly to part with their Interest in the Government, which they had so many Years managed, and are supposed to be invested with by the Apostles themselves; when the being deprived of such a Dignity and Privilege, that had such a Foundation, must needs touch them, and excite a Zeal in them to defend that Power which was left them, and that by the Apostles; and yet we find no Complaints ever made about it. How strange likewise is it, that afterwards seditious Presbyters should make no use of this in their Contests with their Bishops, particularly those that contended with St. *Cyprian*: That neither the five Presbyters of the Faction of *Felicissimus*, nor *Novatus*, none of whom were defective in Subtlety to defend their Actions, and hence to lay hold on any plausible Arguments to apologize for their undutiful Carriage towards their excellent Bishop, should make use of this, had they known it. S. *Cyprian*^b taxed the former for not submitting to that which was decreed

^b *Cypr. Epist. 43.*

by himself and other Bishops, concerning them who had *Lapsed* in times of Persecution: These he accuses of Innovation, and their factious Conspiracy of Rebellion, and of such Actions which tended to destroy all sacerdotal Authority. Now 'tis strange, if these Men knew of any such Change, (which had it been, must at that little Distance be remembred) they should not tell *St. Cyprian*, that Presbyters were originally equal with himself and other Bishops, and hence had as good a Right to make Decrees as Bishops themselves; seeing Presbyters were by the Apostles invested with this Authority, and were afterwards, after the Apostles times, deprived of it. But poor Men, they knew nothing of all this. It was then a Secret, tho' pretended to be decreed thro' the whole World; otherwise no doubt they, who had with so much Malignity opposed their Bishop, would not have failed to use this Topick, had they been acquainted with it, in vindicating their Opposition.

4. This pretended Change of Government is directly contrary to what is delivered by Persons who lived in the next Age after the Apostles, who tell us that the Apostles themselves settled Bishops in Churches. Had we no other Instance, this is evident from that Passage of *Ireneus*, l. 3. c. 3. which tells us that the holy Martyr *Polycarp* was made Bishop of *Smyrna* by the Apostles themselves. This Testimony we have no reason to reject, when given by one of undoubted Probity, and by one who had Opportunity of knowing it, in that he himself had seen *Polycarp* in his younger Days, as he tells us in the same place; and when owned (as we shall see) by *St. Jerom* himself. Much more might have been here added, had not Writers of greater Antiquity than *S. Jerom*, transmitted to us the Names of such who were placed by the Apostles themselves or their Fellow-Labourers, Bishops of *Rome*, *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, *Ephesus*, and other Churches, besides *Jerusalem*; and

and given us the Names of their Successors in a continued *Series* down to their own time.

5. Let us consider the Grounds which *St. Jerom* in the same place produces for his Opinion, and 'tis the Ambiguity of the Words *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in the New Testament: Particularly *Phil. 1. 1.* where *St. Paul* writes to the Saints at *Philippi* with the *Bishops* and *Deacons*. Now he argues, that when *Philippi* was a City of *Macedon*, and there could be no more than one Bishop in the same City, *St. Paul* must mean Presbyters by the Word *Bishops* in that place. And he confirms this Interpretation from *Acts 20, 27, 28. Heb. 13. 17. 1 Pet. 5. 1.* The Sum of his Argument is this. Presbyters are sometimes called Bishops in the Scriptures, and Bishops called Presbyters, therefore they are the same Office. But this will not follow: Nay, one of the Texts he cites, *viz. 1. Pet. 5. 1.* proves the quite contrary. *St. Peter*, who was an *Apostle*, styles himself a *Presbyter*; therefore according to this Reasoning, the Office of an *Apostle* and of a *Presbyter* is the same, and then the Apostles were no more than mere Presbyters. And then (as one rightly observes) "If *Peter* were but a
" *Presbyter*, we shall be at a great Loss to find
" any Bishops in Scripture, or indeed any other Mi-
" nisters of Christ that were superior to Presby-
" ters." But this Consideration of the Words *Bishop* and *Presbyter* being synonymous, has been before treated of in the *Preface*.

6. The Account *St. Jerom* gives us in this place, if taken in the Sense that our Adversaries understand it, is not consistent with what he himself has delivered in other Places of his Works where he writes more sedately. 1. His allowing no Bishops in the Church till 35 Years after the Apostles, consists not with what he says in his *Catalogue* of Christian Writers; where he tells us, "That *Ignatius* was Bishop
" of the Church of *Antioch*, the third after *St. Peter*,
" and was martyred under *Trajan*. That *Polycarp* a
Disci-

“ Disciple of the Apostle *John*, was by him ordain-
 “ ed Bishop of *Smyrna*, who had seen, and had for
 “ his Instructors, some of the Apostles, and of them
 “ who had seen our Lord : That *Clemens*, whom
 “ *St. Paul* mentions in his Epistle to the *Philippians*,
 “ was Bishop of *Rome*; and that he died in the third
 “ Year of *Trajan* : That *Anianus* succeeded *St. Mark*
 “ at *Alexandria* in the eighth Year of *Nero*” :
 That *St. James* the just was ordained Bishop of *Jeru-*
salem by the Apostles, not long after Christ’s Ascen-
 sion.

I’ll only add what he saith of *St. John*, and that is,
 that he last of all the rest wrote his Gospel, *rogatus*
ab Asia Episcopis, “ being desired to do it by the Bi-
 shops of *Asia*” ; which shews that *St. Jerom* believed
 that there were Bishops placed in the Churches of *A-*
sia before *St. John*’s death, and therefore long before
 the Time, that *Blondel*, &c. would persuade us,
 that according to *St. Jerom*, Bishops were introduc’d
 into the Church. Let me add, if at the time that
St. John wrote his Gospel, then also at the time when
 other Apostles, or at least Persons of equal Autho-
 rity with them, were alive, in that some of them
 gave their Testimony to his Gospel, which they ex-
 pressed *Joh. 21. 24. WE know that his Testimony is*
true. None but Apostles or extraordinary Persons,
θεόπνευστοι, could express themselves with such Au-
 thority. All this shews, that when *St. Jerom* wrote
 his *Catalogue*, he believed there were Bishops in the
 Church in the time of the Apostles, and therefore
 placed there by the Apostles.

2. We find *St. Jerom* making a clear and full Di-
 stinction betwixt Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons;
 he reckons them as distinct Offices with a Subordina-
 tion to each other, making the Deacon inferior to
 the Presbyter, and the Presbyter to the Bishop, and
 consequently these two last not the same Office. This
 he doth in his *Dialogue* with the *Luciferians*, where
 he resembles the Church to *Noah’s Ark*, which from

30 Cubits by Degrees ended in one. In like manner the Church *multis gradibus consistens*, *ad extremum Diaconis, Presbyteris, Episcopisque finitur*: which rising by many Steps, ends [at the top] with Deacons, Presbyters and Bishops.

3. St. *Jerom* shews what Deference and Respect was due to these Offices, and that the highest was to be paid to the Bishop. This he doth on *Mich. 7.* where he cautions Christians against "putting their Confidence in their Leaders, either in Bishop, in Presbyter or in Deacon;" whom he reckons as distinct Offices. Then he adds. "But I say not this, as if we ought not to be subject to these [gradibus] Degrees or Orders in the Church. For whoever curseth Father or Mother, shall surely be put to Death. And the Apostle teacheth to obey them that have the rule over us in the Church. But 'tis one thing to honour our Leaders, and another thing to put our Hope in them. Let us honour the Bishop, respect the Presbyter, rise up to the Deacon, but not put our Trust in them.

4. St. *Jerom* often shews the Bishops eminent Station in the Church, and that Subjection is due to them. This he doth in his Epistle to *Theophilus*: "We are not (says he) so puffed up, as to be ignorant what Duty is owing to the Priests of Christ. He that receiveth them, receiveth not them, but him whose Bishops they are. But then let them be content with their Honour. Let them know themselves to be Fathers, not Lords." And withal, that Bishops are the supreme Officers in Christ's Church, to whom the Church is particularly committed: On *Esai 60.* which is rendred in Latin, *Ponam Principes tuos in pacem, & Episcopos tuos in justitiam*, he observes, that the holy Scriptures give the Name of *Princes* to them who should be Bishops of the Church. And in many Places of his Works styles them *Principes Ecclesie*, Princes of the Church; particularly in his *Catalogue of Christian Writers*,

he styles *Polycarp*, who (he tells us) was Disciple of *St. John*, and by him ordained Bishop of *Smyrna*, Prince of all Asia. And in his Epistle 54. *ad Marcell.* which is written against the *Montanists*, he places Bishops in the room of the Apostles. *Apud nos Apostolorum locum tenent Episcopi; apud eos [Montanistas] Episcopus tertius est.* But I must refer the Reader, who desires to know what *St. Jerom* says more to this purpose, to the excellent Bishop of *Chester's* Vindication of *St. Ignatius*, Part I. c. II. p. 191, 192, 193. And how he speaks of these different Orders even in the times of the Apostles: As also how necessary Bishops are to the Being of a Church; when he says in his *Dialog. adv Lucifer. Ecclesia non est que non habet Sacerdotes.* "That's no Church which has "no Priests." Now, that *St. Jerom* by *Sacerdotes* means Bishops and Presbyters, that learned Prelate shews from other Places of the same Father. The same fully appears from a Passage in *Diatog. adv. Lucifer. Ecclesie salus in Summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors quadam, & ab hominibus eminent detur Potestas, tot in Ecclesia efficiuntur Schismata quot Sacerdotes.* "The Church's Safety depends "on the Dignity of the Chief Priest [or Bishop] to "whom if a peculiar and eminent Authority is not "yielded, there will be as many Schisms as there "are Priests in the Church." I'll produce only one Instance more out of *St. Jerom*, from whence we may know what his Thoughts were in this Case; and that is out of the same Epistle, that to *Evagrius*, from which some, much celebrated Passages, are urged by our Adversaries, for the Identity of the Office of Bishop and Presbyter. It is this: *Ut sciamus Traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de Veteri Testamento, quod Aaron & Filii ejus, & Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi, Presbyteri & Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia.* He there represents it as an Apostolick Tradition, "That "what *Aaron*, his Sons, and the *Levites* were in the "Temple under the Old Testament, the same do
"Bishops

“ *Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons* challenge in the “ Christian Church.” In which Place, as he reckons up these as three distinct Offices in the Christian Church, so he shews their Subordination by the like Degrees that there were in the Jewish Church; in which *Aaron*, and his Successors in the High-Priesthood, were of the highest Order, and had peculiar Offices assigned to them, which inferior Priests could not execute: The *Sons of Aaron*, who were simply called Priests, were of the second Order, and had peculiar Functions which the *Levites* had no Authority to execute; and the *Levites* were the third and lowest Order in the Ministration of the Temple Service: In like manner in the Christian Church, there are *Bishops*, who are equally the supreme Governors there, as the High-Priest was in the Jewish Church; the *Presbyters* next, answerable to the second Order of Priests; and lastly the *Deacons*, who are in a lower Station, as the *Levites* were among the *Jews*. And *St. Jerom* premises this, with telling us, that it was an *Apostolick Tradition*, or a Truth delivered to the Church by the Apostles who were divinely inspired. And that it is evidently such, appears from what I have (*Chap. 5.*) cited to the same purpose out of the Epistle of *St. Clement*, who was a Fellow-Labourer with the Apostles, and is mentioned as such by *St. Paul*, *Phil. 4. 3.* I might have farther proved this by what *St. Jerom* says in *Dialog. adv. Lucifer. c. 4.* where he denies all Power to *Presbyters* and *Deacons* to baptize without the *Bishops* Leave. — *Sine Episcopi jussione, neq; Presbyter neq; Diaconus jus habeant baptizandi.* By which he fully declares the Eminency of the Bishop’s Power in the Church, and the Obedience and Subjection due to him from *Presbyters* as well as *Deacons*. And even then, (on *Tit. 1.*) when he endeavours to advance the Power of *Presbyters* by giving them a Share in the Government, he allows them no more than to be of Council to the Bishop, which we never deny them. — *in commune debere*

228 *An History of the Government*

Ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen, qui cum haberet solus praesse populo Israelitico, elegit Septuaginta, cum quibus populum judicaret.

I would only observe farther, how unreasonably *St. Jerom* is made an Enemy of Episcopacy, when he never endeavoured a Change of that Government; when he lived and dyed in Communion with Bishops, which I pray God those would do who urge his Authority; when he paid a Deference to *St. Augustin*, tho' much younger than himself, because he was a Bishop, and himself only a Presbyter. *Vale, etate fili, dignitate parens.*

My Business being to write an History, and thence to treat of Matters of Fact; I forbear to prosecute what has been observed by others, how the Assertion of *St. Jerom*, which makes the Government by Presbyters, (which he supposes first established in the Church) unable to prevent or compose Schisms in the Church, nay that (as he intimates) which sows the Seeds of Dissentions, highly reflects on the Wisdom and Goodness of our blessed Saviour, and of his Apostles, who (as he supposes) settled such a Government, or at least neglected to settle any other. And withal, how little this tends to recommend Presbyterian Government, when it is so unable to put an End to Discords which arise in the Church, that it lays a Foundation for them, as was found in about 40 Years Trial thereof: And how unfit a Motive this is to persuade any rational Men to endeavour the destroying of Government by Bishops, which (according to *St. Jerom*) was generally agreed on in the whole World as a sufficient and proper Means to preserve Peace and Union, and thence universally received in all Churches, and continued in all times ever since, till the Change made at *Geneva*: When withal, it is a Government settled among us by the strongest Laws; nay farther, is a fundamental part of our Constitution both in Church and State. The Reader may find this fully handled by

Bishop Parker in his *Case of the Church of England*, p. 222. And in his *Account of the Government of the Church for the first 600 Years*.

Before I dismiss St. Jerom, I think it not improper to take notice what his Thoughts were of Diocesan Episcopacy; that is, the setting up one Bishop over many Parochial Churches, it being violently opposed by the Adversaries of our *English Church-Government*. In that celebrated Place on *Tit. i.* so much insisted on by *Blondel*; St. Jerom, to prove that *St. Paul, Phil. i. i.* by Bishops means Presbyters, thus argues. "*Philippi* (says he) is one City of *Macedonia*, & certè in unâ civitate plures (ut nuncupantur) *Episcopi esse non poterant*. And certainly there cannot be more Bishops (as they are called) [than one] in one City." And the same he presently after observes of *Ephesus*. This was such a received Maxim in the Church, and this at all times, that he makes this the Foundation of an Argument. Let the City be never so large, the Christians therein never so numerous, yet there ought to be one Bishop over that one City. And he declares, in the forecited Epistle to *Evagrius*, that the Bishop of *Eugubium*, a small City, was as much a Bishop as the Bishop of *Rome*, that vast imperial City: But he never took him to be more a Bishop, or that the large Extent of that City of *Rome*, and the District belonging to it, did unbishop him, and change the Species of the Government; a Church so large, that above a hundred Years before that time, in *St. Cyprian's* Days, whilst the Emperors of *Rome* were not only Strangers, but also Enemies to Christianity, there were forty and six Presbyters belonging to it: And we must imagin it to have a much larger Extent under a Succession of several Christian Emperors. Yet St. Jerom is so far from disowning the Bishop of *Rome* from being a true Bishop, notwithstanding his large Diocese; that he makes his Application to *Damasus* as a Bishop, and submits himself to him in Matters of great moment,

as may be seen in his Epistles: * In which he pays as great a Deference, as could be expected from one of St. *Jerom's* Temper. His Thoughts of the Largeness of Dioceses may be also collected from a Passage in his *Dialog. adv. Lucif.* where the Orthodox Person thus speaks. " I deny not but that this has been the Custom of the Churches, in respect to them who have been baptized by Presbyters and Deacons, (*longè*) far off [from the Bishop's Residence] *in minoribus urbibus*, in lesser Cities, for the Bishop to go abroad to invoke the Holy Spirit [on them] by Imposition of [his] Hands. And a little after. They were to be lamented, who having been baptized *in Viculis, aut in Castellis, aut in remotioribus locis*, in Villages, or in Garrisons, or in Places remote [from the Bishop's Residence] by Presbyters and Deacons, dyed before the Bishops visited those Places." Both which Passages shew how large Dioceses were in St. *Jerom's* time, that there were many Villages and other Places that were under a Bishop's Jurisdiction, yet at a Distance from the City of which he was the Pastor, in which Towns, Presbyters and Deacons were placed to baptize and instruct and perform other sacred Ministrations; which Places the Bishops used at certain Seasons to visit, and among other Ends, to lay his Hands on such as had been baptized by Presbyters and Deacons, that they might have the Holy Spirit conferred on them.

I have thus, as briefly as I could conveniently, considered St. *Jerom's* Opinion, which has been so much insisted on by the Enemies of Episcopacy, and shewn of how little Service it is to the Cause for which they produce it. But these Persons, especially D. *Blondel*, have amassed several Passages out of other Fathers, to back what he seems to assert: I shall briefly consider them, and shew to what little

* *Hieron. Ep. 57. 58.*

purpose they are produced. First, none of them assert that Matter of Fact which is asserted by *St. Jerom*, viz. that a Change was made of Church-Government from a Council of Presbyters to that of a single Person, or Bishop. But besides, if *St. Chrysostom*, *Pseudo-Ambrose*, *Theodoret*, &c. (for the Testimonies of *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alex.* *Origen*, and others more ancient have been considered) had asserted it, and this could be tolerably inferred from their Writings; yet 'tis clear that the same Objection lyes against them, as against *St. Jerom*, viz. that they lived too long after the Time, in which 'tis supposed this Change was made, and consequently too late to be Witnesses. Besides, they lived in Times wherein the Church (as it cannot be denied) was universally governed by Bishops, of which Order many of those Fathers were; nay, long after that time, in which, by that Assertion, 'tis acknowledged that Bishops were every where throughout the whole World settled among Christians. Tho' this would be sufficient to shew, of how little use the Testimony of those Fathers are, for maintaining that for which they are produced: Yet I shall farther endeavour to clear them from the Sense that has been put upon them by the Adversaries of Episcopacy.

The chief of the Latin Fathers that is produced, who seems next to *St. Jerom*, to favour the Cause of the Presbyterian Parity, is he, whose Commentaries on *St. Paul's Epistles*, accompany *St. Ambrose's Works*, who lived in the time of *Damasus*, and thence of *St. Jerom*, whose Name was *Hilary*. 'Tis owned, that he asserts the promiscuous Use of *Episcopus* and *Presbyter* in the Holy Scriptures. But notwithstanding this, that he thought the Names confounded; yet withal he thought that the Offices of Bishop and Presbyter were distinct, and that Bishops were in the Apostles time, or at least, about the time of their Death, settled in particular Churches. For speaking of *Timothy* (in his Preface to his

232 *An History of the Government*

Commentaries on the Epistles to him,) he saith,
Hunc ergo jam creatum Episcopum instruit, &c. "The
 " Apostle instructs him, who was now made a Bi-
 " shop, how he ought to govern the Church." And
 the like of *Titus*. *Titum Apostolus consecrat Episco-*
pum, &c. "He ordained *Titus* a Bishop, and advised
 " him to be very careful in governing the Church."
 On *1 Tim.* 4. "There ought to be seven Deacons,
 " and several Presbyters in Churches, but only one
 " Bishop." I refer the Reader to the learned Bishop
Pearson's Vindic. Ignat. Part II. c. 13. p. 175, 176.
 for other Citations out of this Father to the same
 purpose; adding only here one Passage out of him,
 as *Amalarius (de Offic. Eccl. 1. 2. c. 13.)* has cited it
Beatis Apostolis decedentibus, illi, qui post illos ordinati
sunt ut præsessent Ecclesiis, illis primis exæquari non pote-
rant, neque miraculorum testimonium par illis habere,
sed in multis aliis inferiores illis esse videbantur; grave
existimaverunt Apostolorum sibi vendicare nuncupatio-
nem. Diviserunt ergo nomina ipsa, & iisdem, i. e. Pres-
byteris presbyterii nomen reliquerunt; alii verò Episcopi
sunt nuncupati, hi qui & Ordinationis præditi potestate,
ita ut plenissime iidem præpositos se Ecclesiarum esse cog-
noscerent. "Whereas after the Apostles Death, they
 " that were ordained after them to preside over the
 " Churches, could not be equalled to those first [Go-
 " vernors] being inferior to them in respect of the
 " Testimony of Miracles, and many other things:
 " It seemed too great for them to challenge to them-
 " selves the Name of *Apostles*. They therefore di-
 " vided the Names, [which had been before used
 " promiscuously] leaving the Name of *Presbyters* to
 " some [who had both Names before] and the other
 " [*i. e.* they who succeeded the Apostles in the Go-
 " vernment of the Church] were named *Bishops*,
 " these who were invested with the Power of Ordi-
 " nation, that they might know themselves to be set
 " over the Churches with a *plenary* Authority."
 From which Passage 'tis evident, that this Father
 thought,

thought, that the Government of the Church was in the Apostles, during their Abode on Earth; that upon their Decease, Bishops succeeded them in that Government; that the Names both of Presbyter and Bishop had been given to them who were of the inferior Office during the Lives of the Apostles, but after their Death, that the Name of *Presbyter* was appropriated to the inferior Order, and that of *Bishop* to the superior Order, viz. to them who succeeded the Apostles in governing the Church; and that these assumed that Name, rather than that of Apostle; because tho' they succeeded them in governing the Church, yet they were inferior to them in many other Respects, especially in that they had not the Gift of Miracles: However, that they were set over the Church *plenissime* with the *fullest Right*; and that their Eminency in the Church was evident, in that the Power of Ordination, (which they, to whom the Name of Presbyters was now appropriated, wanted) was conferred on them as their peculiar Right.

The next I shall consider, is St. *Chrysostom*, and the rather, because that which others are cited to say to the same Purpose, is transcribed from him, whom they follow in this, as in other things; and that not undeservedly for the most part, he being an excellent Commentator on the Holy Scriptures; so that what I shall say in Answer to him, will be a sufficient Answer to what is transcribed from him.

The Sum of what our Adversaries collect out of this pious and eloquent Father's Works, is that the words *Episcopus* and *Presbyter*, Bishop and Elder, were used promiscuously, and denote the same Office in St. *Paul's* Epistles: And however, that when St. *Paul* had handled the Duty of Bishops, he omitted that of Presbyters, because they were much the same. From which they would infer, that St. *Chrysostom* judged them to be the same Offices, and that he thought there was no Difference betwixt a Bishop and a Presbyter.

I shall

I shall thus far grant what our Adversaries contend for, that this, and some other of the ancient Fathers, make *St. Paul* to use the words Bishop and Presbyter promiscuously; but what they infer from thence has no Foundation, viz. that these are the same Office, in that (as has been already observed) when *St. Paul* wrote his Epistles, tho' there were Presbyters in Churches, yet there were then no fixed Bishops, (excepting in the Church of *Jerusalem*, and its Bishop was an Apostle) to preside over them; the Apostles reserving the Government of Churches in their own Hands, which they at first executed themselves; and afterwards, (when Christianity spread in the World, and their Province was enlarged) by other Ministers, such as *Timothy* and *Titus*, whom they authorized, and entrusted with the Care of one or more Churches, as they found it necessary. Hence when there were none of the supreme Order set over particular Churches as their fixed Bishops, (that Power being only in the Apostles, and together with them, in some, who are by *St. Clement* styled ἐλλόγιμοι, extraordinary Persons commissioned by the Apostles to set in order Affairs in Churches, which their Care in founding and governing other Churches would not permit them to perfect :) 'tis no wonder that *St. Paul* should only mention and give Directions about the Choice of *Deacons*; and of them to whom the Name of *Presbyter* was afterwards appropriated, as being only fixed Officers in Churches; and that he should call these later ἐπισκόπους, Overseers (as 'tis rendred by us, *Acts* 20. 28.) when 'tis a word that might mind them of their Duty, especially if it denote (as *Mr. Dodwell* has shewn, *Paran.* §. 30.) a Care of providing for the Poor: Tho' after the Apostles Death, the Name was appropriated to Persons of the highest Order, who succeeded the Apostles in governing the Church, and were by them constituted to preside over particular Districts. Consequently, the Reason is evident, why *St. Chrysostom* asser-

asserted that the words *Episcopus* and *Presbyter* were used promiscuously by St. Paul, and generally for the same Office. But this great Man's Opinion in this thing, will be of no Service to Dissenters, when we can shew, that tho' he looks on the Names confounded, yet he makes the Offices distinct. For in respect to Names, he observes that other ecclesiastical Titles are confounded by St. Paul, as well as this; that a Bishop is sometimes called Διάκονος, a Deacon, and that he bids Timothy, a Bishop, to fulfil Διакониαν, his Deaconship. But withal, he plainly distinguishes Bishops from Presbyters, asserts them to be distinct Offices, and that in (at least) the latter times of the Apostles. This plainly appears from what he says in his Commentary on Phil. 1. 1. on the Words the Bishops and Deacons. "What is this? (saith he) "were there many Bishops of one City? No; but "thus he calls the Presbyters; for then those Names "were used in common, and even the Bishop was "called Διάκονος, a Deacon." Where he acknowledges that Bishops were settled in each City; that they were sometimes called ἐπίσκοποι, sometimes πρεσβύτεροι, sometimes Διάκονοι, in that these words were not at first, as they were afterwards appropriated to particular Offices. For repeating what he had said before of the Identity of the Words in the time of the Apostles, he adds. "But afterwards τὸ ἰσχυρίζου "ἐκάστῳ δαπνέμεν ὄνομα, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος. "To each of these the appropriate Name was given, i. e. Bishop and Presbyter." I'll add but one more Citation out of St. Chrysostom's Works, to shew what his Thoughts were of the Distinction of these Offices; and that out of his 11th Homily on 1 Tim. "After [St. Paul] had discoursed of Bishops, and "shewn what they ought to do, and from what they "ought to abstain, passing over the Order of Presbyters, he immediately proceeds to the Deacons: "On what Reason? Because there was not any great "Difference betwixt that [of Presbyters] and that " of

236 *An History of the Government*

“ of *Bishops*. For even they [*i. e.* Presbyters] were
 “ appointed to teach, and to preside over the
 “ Church; so that what he said to the Bishops,
 “ might suit the Presbyters; only they excel in
 “ that [Prerogative] of *Imposition of Hands*, and in
 “ this only were superior to Presbyters.” In which
 words (cited by *Blondel* himself) he clearly shews,
 that he thought that there were in the time of the
 Apostles, not only Deacons in the Church, but also
 Bishops and Presbyters; that these were distinct
 Offices, tho’ of near Affinity to each other: And
 that they were distinct, and the Bishops superior;
 because they were invested with the Power of Im-
 position of Hands, which the Presbyters wanted; a
 Prerogative, which he (*Homil. 6. in 1 Tim.*) styles
 “ πάντῃς μάλιστα κυριώτατον, the highest or chiefest
 “ of all ecclesiastical Offices, and which chiefly holds
 “ the Church together. This last Expression seems
 to intimate that the *Imposition of Hands* which he
 speaks of, denotes the Power which we call *Confirma-
 tion*, as well as that of *Ordination*; both of which
 highly advance the Office of a *Bishop* above that of a
 Presbyter: Especially, if together with these, we
 understand that of *Reconciling Penitents*, which was
 performed by that Ceremony. This, if performed
 by Presbyters, was done by the special Concession of,
 if not Commission from the Bishop. But this I hum-
 bly submit to the Judgment of the judicious and
 learned Reader, being sensible that χειροτονεῖν chiefly
 signifies to *Ordain*. The Reader may find more Ci-
 tations out of *St. Chrysostom* to the same purpose,
 collected by Bishop *Pearson* in his *Vindic. Ignat.* Part
 2. c. 13. p. 173.—which manifests *Blondel’s* Falshood
 in representing that Father’s Opinion for the Parity
 of Bishops and Presbyters.

Most of the others whom *Blondel* and later Writers
 from him, cite, who following *St. Chrysostom*, make
 the Names of Bishop and Presbyter the same in the
 New Testament, are for the most part Transcribers
 out

out of him ; and therefore as they deserve not, so they need not any farther Answer : Especially, when at that time when these Writers lived, 'tis evident, and the most learned of our Adversaries acknowledge it, that the whole Church of Christ was then governed by Bishops, Officers of an Order superior to Presbyters.

However, I shall not omit *Theodoret* the learned Bishop of *Cyrus*, who, as the former, acknowledges the promiscuous Use of the Names, on *Phil. 1. 1.* But withal asserts the Distinction of the Offices of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, and that Bishops were superior to Presbyters. Even in his Commentary on the same Epistle, he makes *Epaphroditus*, whom *St. Paul* calls the *Apostle* of the *Philippians*, to be their *Bishop*; and argues that the Episcopal Authority was committed to him, because he was honoured with the Name of an *Apostle*. On *Phil. 2. 25.* he saith that *St. Paul* names him their "Apostle, because he had
" entrusted the Pastoral Care of them to him; so
" that it was manifest that those Persons that mini-
" stered under him, whom in the beginning of the
" Epistle he calls Bishops, were indeed of the Order
" of Presbyters." There he makes *Epaphroditus* Governor of that Church, superior to Presbyters, and of an higher Order. In his Commentary on *1 Tim. 3.* he most fully and clearly declares his Judgment in this Particular. ^d *They sometimes, (saith he) called the same Persons both Presbyters and Bishops; and those who now are called Bishops, they named Apostles. But in process of time, the Name of Apostles was reserved to them who were truly Apostles; and they gave the Name of Bishop to them who were formerly*

^d *Theodoret in Tim. 3.* Τὰς αὐτὰς ἐκάλεον ποτὲ Πρεσβύτεροι καὶ Ἐπισκόποι. πῶς δὲ νῦν καλουμένοις Ἐπισκόποις Ἀποστόλους ὀνόμαζον. Τὸ δὲ χεῖν περιόντι τὸ μὲν τῷ Ἀποστόλῃ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀληθῶς Ἀποστόλοις κατέλιπον. ἢ δὲ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ προσηγορίαν τοῖς πάλαι καλουμένοις Ἀποστόλοις ἐπέθεσαν. Οὕτω φιλιππησίων Ἀπόστολος ὁ Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἦν, &c.

238 *An History of the Government*

called Apostles. In this Sense Epaphroditus is called the Apostle of the Philippians, Titus of the Cretians, and Timotheus of them of Asia.

From which 'tis plain what *Theodore*t's Judgment was : That there were in the Apostles time two superior Orders of Christ's Ministers, besides that of Deacons, viz. Bishops, who were then called *Apostles*, and *Presbyters* who were then called either *Bishops* or *Presbyters* : But that afterwards they of the superior Order, reserving the Name of *Apostle* to them who were such in a strict Sense, appropriated the Name of *Bishop* to themselves, as they did that of *Presbyter* to them of the second Order of Priesthood.

Having mentioned *Theodore*t, I might produce some Passages out of his Works to overthrow that Opinion, that a Bishop is only a Pastor of a single Congregation : As that in his Epistle to *Leo*, where he tells him that he had the Pastoral Care of 800 Churches. For the Vindication of which against Mr. *Baxter*'s Objections, and the Citation of other Passages of *Theodore*t to the same purpose, I refer the Reader to Bishop *Stillingsfleet*'s *Unreasonableness of Separation*, Part 3. S. 10. p. 256. *Theodore*t supposes that, even in the times of the Apostles, the Jurisdiction of Bishops was of a large Extent, when, in his Introduction to his Commentary on the Epistle to *Titus*, he calls *Titus* Bishop of *Crete*, *μεγίστην ἑσῆαν*, a very large Island. And on 1. *Tim.* 3. says that *Timothy* was Bishop of the *Asians*, which in its strictest Sense must extend to the *Lydian Asia*, in which were the seven Churches mentioned *Rev.* 1. 11. Now in each of these, when *St. John* wrote his *Revelation*, there was a *Bishop* or *Angel*, who presided over them; and in all probability, most of these had much a larger District than a single Congregation.

But dismissing this, I return to what I was before considering, and that was *Blondel*'s perverse Reasoning, that because several of the Fathers in the fourth and following Centuries declare that the words *Episcopus*

copus and *Presbyter* are used promiscuously in the New Testament, and that the word *Episcopus* often denotes only a *Presbyter*; that they thought that the Office of Bishop and *Presbyter* were the same; when (1) 'tis plain, that most of them do expressly except the Power of Ordination, as proper to Bishops: And that most of them make Bishops and *Presbyters* to agree in this thing only or chiefly, in that they are both *Sacerdotal* Offices; and that what they speak to advance the Office of *Presbyters* by equalling it in several respects with that of Bishops, was, partly in opposition to the Deacons Arrogance, who had demeaned themselves proudly towards them; and partly as reflecting on some Bishops, who had injuriously debarred them from Preaching. But farther, let us consider (2) that Bishops, superior to *Presbyters*, had for above 200 Years governed the Church, according to the Consent of our most learned Adversaries, when *St. Chrysostom*, *Pseude-Ambrose*, &c. wrote. If therefore they had believed, that it ought to have been otherwise in their own time, they ought to have opposed that established Government by Bishops; and being holy, pious and excellent Persons, we must in Charity believe that they would have done it. And tho' it might have been impossible for them to make a general Reformation, yet we cannot in Charity suspect that the holy *Chrysostom*, and those great Saints, *Basil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Augustin*, all Bishops, (tho' wrested by *Blondel* to patronize Presbyterian Parity) had they been convinced that their *Presbyters* had equal Authority with themselves, would any longer have persisted to usurp over them, to abridge them of that Power they believed Christ had invested them with, or rob them of Authority to ordain, confirm, and equally to share in governing the Church with themselves. Yet we find no Condescensions of this kind in these holy Bishops, nor any Step made by them towards such a Change; nor any of their *Pres-*

byters taking Advantage from what their Bishops had said, to make any Challenge of their Rights, or thence to put in a Plea for them, as injuriously detained from them. None of that Age made such an Interpretation of those holy Fathers words: No, this was an Invention reserved for the quick-sighted Men of this last Age to discern, who are not concerned to make the Words and Actions of these eminent Saints consistent with each other, nor what they write in one place reconcilable with what they deliver in other Passages in their Works.

I would again observe, that what that eminent Commentator *St. Chrysostom* has delivered, is repeated, and almost transcribed by many of the following Ages, which is owned by *Blondel* himself, with respect to the *Bulgarian* Archbishop *Theophylact*, and to *OEcumenius*, and holds the same in a great measure with respect to others cited by him, who, if they use not the words, yet give us the Sense of the justly admired *St. Chrysostom*; and consequently deserve not any particular Consideration.

Whereas there is a Passage in *St. Jerom's* Epistle to *Evagrius*, which our Adversaries improve to the Disservice of Episcopacy, and especially it being Historical, I may seem obliged (tho' mentioned Chap. 9.) more particularly to consider it. 'Tis as follows: *Nam & Alexandria a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam & Dionysium Episcopos Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faciat.* " At *Alexandria* from *Mark* down " to *Heraclas* and *Dionysius* the Bishops [of that " Church,] the Presbyters always named one, " whom, being chosen from among themselves, " they called their Bishop, he being placed in " a higher Station, in the same manner as if an Army should make their General.

From this Passage of *St. Jerom*, tis evident (1) That he owned, that from the time of *S. Mark*, who

who was the Founder of the Church of *Alexandria*, and the Governor of it whilst alive, and thence called by *St. Jerom* himself, the first Bishop of that Church; that there were all along Bishops of that Church, *Heracles* and *Dionysius* being such, and these the Successors of *Anianus*, whom *St. Mark* appointed for their Bishop, in which we have the Consent of ancient Writers.

2. 'Tis farther evident, that this Bishop, when chosen according to the Custom here mentioned, was in *St. Jerom's* Opinion, thereby advanced to a higher Station; (*excelsiori gradu collocatus*) than he was in before when only a Presbyter, and thenceforward invested with greater Authority, and not merely as *πρωτοκαθεδρία*, as *Blondel* interprets it; as is still farther manifest by the Parallel he brings to illustrate it, viz. a Person being made a General by an Army; who tho' before his Election he had no Authority; yet upon his being made a General, received a Right to command the Army, even those who elected him; answerable to which he makes that of a Bishop over his Church. And indeed this was the Doctrine of the Church, and particularly of the great Doctors of that Church of *Alexandria*, *Clemens* and *Origen*, as I have shewn, Chap. 9.

3. All that is affirmed by *St. Jerom* is, that the Presbyters Named one of themselves; which Naming, if meant of Election, confined the Electors to the Presbyters, not admitting the Suffrage of Neighbour Bishops, or Testimony of the People, as in other Churches; so it confined them in respect to the Person to be chosen, to be one of themselves, of which more presently. But all this goes no farther than Election, and hinders not his being ordained to this Office by the Imposition of the Hands of neighbouring Bi-

* *Præfat in Matth. Marcus, interpres Apostoli Pauli, Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ primus Episcopus.*

shops. And whatever the Adversaries of Episcopacy may imagin, or their *Eutychius*, without alledging any Testimony, might assert; 'tis clear that St. *Jerom* could not mean that the Presbyters *ordained* their Bishop, when in this same Epistle, where he so much equals the Power of Presbyters with that of Bishops, he excepts that Power of Ordination: Nay, immediately after that Parallel that he gives to illustrate that Custom at *Alexandria*; *Quid enim facit, excepta Ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?*

4. It may rationally be questioned, whether St. *Jerom*'s Expression of *nominabant*, signifies any thing farther than the Presbyters *proposing* to the Electors some Person to be Bishop, only that he should be one of themselves. The Electors might be either other Bishops, or, together with them, the People. For that the People at *Alexandria* had a Share in the Choice of their Bishop, appears from a Passage in *Epiphanius*, *Har.* 69. who tells us, "That it was a Custom at *Alexandria*, after the Death of the Bishop, not to defer the Choice of a Successor; but for Peace sake immediately to set upon it, lest Contentions should arise among the People, whilst some desired one, some another." Which is farther implied from the Suggestion used by *Athanasius* his Enemies, who objected, tho' falsely, the Want of the People's Consent, as a Defect in his Election to that See. The Falshood of which Accusation, the Bishops of *Egypt*, met in a Synod, shew, by telling the World how unanimously the People of that City requested that *Athanasius* might be their Bishop. Tho' possibly this Interest of the Laity might be of later Date, and not so ancient as the time that St. *Jerom* speaks of. Therefore not insisting on that, let us consider what the full Import of that Passage is.

St. *Jerom*'s great Design in that Epistle, is, to humble the ambitious Deacons, and to make them demean themselves less arrogantly towards Presbyters.

ters. To which end he recites many things that tend to advance the Dignity of the Office of Presbyters, as has been before observed. Among others, this Custom at *Alexandria*, viz. that in the first Ages of the Church, from St. *Mark* down to *Heracles*, as none but some Presbyter of that Church was in any Vacancy chosen Bishop, so the Nomination was in the Presbyters themselves, and consequently they had, if not the whole, the greatest Share in the Election; so that ordinarily whoever they named, succeeded in that See; and probably they were those who were of the most ancient Standing in the Church. For as at first the ἀπαρχαί, or first Converts in a Church were ordained to the Ministries of that Church (as has been observed), so possibly in *Alexandria* there might be a longer Continuance of that Practice, than in other Churches; or at least, the pitching upon the Person was left to the Presbyters. That whereas in other Churches, that was customary, which St. *Cyprian*, and other Bishops assembled with him, tell the Churches of *Spain*, "That the Bishops of the Province should meet with that People, over whom the Bishop was to be ordained, and he was to be chosen in the presence of the People who knew the Lives of each of them, and were acquainted with their Conversation." And they speak of this as observed *De Traditione Divina & Apostolica Observatione*, as a Divine and Apostolical Tradition, *Epist.* 67. 'Tis probable this Custom was not at first observed at *Alexandria*, but the Bishop was chosen without any Proposal to the People, that the Presbyters named the Person, and this one of themselves, and it may be the senior Presbyter, and he, without any farther Enquiry or Deliberation, was accepted and ordained, (and that tho' not here expressed by the neighbouring Bishops) Bishop of that City. But that afterwards, (probably upon the Cessation of those extraordinary Gifts, which

244 *An History of the Government*

were in the earliest times granted to the first Converts, and was the Ground of their being elected to the most sacred Offices) this Custom came to be changed, as the *Pseud-Ambrose* expresses it, *Quia caperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos,—prospiciente Concilio ut non Ordo sed meritum crearet Episcopum multorum sacerdotum judicio constitutum.* “ Because the Presbyters who came after, were found unworthy for the Primacy, not “ Order [or Seniority] but Merit created the Bishop, who was so constituted by the [concurrent] “ Judgment of many Priests.

To conclude, admitting the matter of Fact to be true, for which *St. Jerom* produces not his Author; this is the most rational Account, so as not to make him inconsistent with himself, and with others who wrote at, or near the time he speaks of, and hence hurts not the Cause of Episcopacy. Tho’ had there been more in it than there is, we may say, as *St. Jerom* himself doth in the like Case, *Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem?* That the peculiar Custom of one Church is not to be put into the Ballance against the Custom of all other Churches in the World; nor one Father’s Assertion against the Testimony of all others that wrote before him, nay, even of himself when he wrote sedately.

Thus, Thanks be to God, I have finished what I designed. The Lord grant it may effect the End which I propounded to my self in writing it, viz. that it may remove the Mistakes and Prejudices which Persons (and I believe several of them truly conscientious) have entertained against the Government of the Church by Bishops; so that they may not any longer continue in a sinful Separation from the Church of *England* which is thus happily governed; but return into its Communion, to the Honour of Almighty God, to their own spiritual Advantage and Comfort here, and their everlasting Felicity hereafter; to the Peace
and

and Welfare of the Church; to the Rejoicing of that part thereof which is on Earth, and to that part thereof which is received into Glory, there being Joy in Heaven at the Repentance of a Sinner. This I shall continue to pray for, and hope that God will hear my Prayers for the sake of his Son *Jesus Christ* our Lord, who hath purchased his Church with his own Blood, to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be all Honour and Glory now and evermore.
Amen.

F I N I S.

B O O K S

BOOKS Printed for, and sold by William Taylor, at the Ship in Pater-noster-row.

AN University Oration concerning the different Fates of the Christian Religion, spoken in the Publick Act of the University of Geneva the 11th Day of May 1708. In which the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy is asserted, Separation on the account of Ceremony is condemn'd, and an universal Conformity of the Protestant Churches to the ancient Discipline and Worship is wish'd for. By *John Alphonsus Turretin*, Pastor, Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History, and Deputy Rector of the University. The Second Edition. To which is added, Dr. *Nicholls's* Thanks to Mr. *Turretin*; Written by Order of the Society for Propagation, for his Oration of the different Fates, dedicated to them.

An Oration of composing the differences among Protestants, wherein the Points in Controversy between the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* are stated, and a Method of Reconciliation proposed, &c. By the same Author.

Atlas Geographus; or, A compleat System of Geography, Ancient and Modern. Containing what is of most Use in *Bleau*, *Varennius*, *Cellarius*, *Cluverius*, *Baudrand*, *Brietius*, *Sanfon*, &c. With the Discoveries and Improvements of the best Modern Authors to this time. Illustrated with about 100 new Maps, done from the latest Observations, by *Herman Moll*, Geographer. And many other Cuts by the best Artists. To be publish'd Monthly.

Three short Treatises, viz. (1.) A modest Plea for the Clergy. (2.) A Sermon of the Sacerdotal Benediction. (3.) A Discourse publish'd to undeceive the People in the Point of Tithes, &c. formerly printed, and now again published, by Dr. *George Hickes*, in Defence of the Priesthood and true Rights of the Church, against the slanderous and reproachful Treatment of the Clergy, in a late Book of pernicious and blasphemous Doctrines, entitul'd, *The Rights of the Church*.

28 IV 58

Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ: or, A Collection of choice Tracts, relating to the Government and Authority of the Church; containing one of Archbishop *Bancroft's*, one of Dr. *Harry Lesley's*, late Bishop of Down in Ireland, two of Dr. *John Pearson's*, Lord Bishop of Chester, one of Mr. *Samuel Hoard's*, Author of *God's Love to Mankind*, one of Dr. *Thomas Bayley's*, with several others. Recommended by the Reverend Dr. *George Hickes*. In Octavo.

A thorough Examination of the False Principles and Fallacious Arguments advanced against the Christian Church, Priesthood and Religion, in a late pernicious Book, ironically intitul'd, *The Rights of the Christian Church asserted*, &c. In a Dialogue between *Demos* and *Hierarchia*. Humbly offered to the Consideration of the Nobility and Gentry of England, by *Samuel Hill*, Rector of *Kilmington*, and Arch-Deacon of *Wells*.

Sortie

Some BOOKS lately printed for Robert Gosling at the Mitre, near the Inner-Temple Gate in Fleetstreet.

THE Antiquities of *Italy*, being the Travels of the learned Father *Montfaucon* from *Paris* through *Italy*, containing an Account of many Antiquities at *Vienne*, *Arles*, *Nismes*, and *Marseilles* in *France*. 2. The Delights of *Italy*, viz. Libraries, Statues, Paintings, Churches, Monuments, Tombs, Inscriptions, Epitaphs, Temples, Monasteries, Palaces, and other curious Structures. 3. Collections of Rarities, wonderful subterraneous Passages and burial Places, old Roads, Gates, &c. with the Description of a noble Monument found under Ground at *Rome*, Anno 1702. made English from the *Paris* Edition, adorn'd with Cuts. Price 6 s.

A view of the *English* Constitution, with respect to the sovereign Authority of the Prince and the Allegiance of the Subject, &c. With a Defence of the View, by way of Reply to the several Answers that have been made to it. By *William Higden*, D. D. Pr. 4 s.

The Antiquities of *St. Peters*, or the Abbey Church of *Westminster*, containing all the Inscriptions, Epitaphs, &c. upon the Tombs and Gravestones. With an Account of the Lives, Marriages and Issues of the most eminent Personages repositied, and their Coats of Arms truly emblazen'd. Adorn'd with Draughts of the Tombs curiously engraven.

The History of the Revolutions in *England* under the Family of the *Stuarts*, from the Year 1603 to 1690. Containing many secret Memoirs relating to that Family, and the last great Revolution Anno 1688. With Characters of the most eminent Personages in every Reign. By *T. D'Orleanse* of the Society of *Jesus*. Translated from the *Paris* Edition of the *French* Original, 8°. Price 5 s.

Memoirs relating to the Impeachment of *Thomas* Earl of *Danby*, (now Duke of *Leeds*) in the Year 1687. Wherein some Affairs of those Times are represented in a juster Light than has hitherto appear'd. With an Appendix, containing the Proceedings in Parliament, Original Papers, Speeches, &c. 8°. Price 4 s.

The Life of *Mr. Thomas Betterton*, the late eminent Tragedian. Wherein the Action and Utterance of the Stage, Bar, and Pulpit are distinctly considered. To which is added, The Amorous Widow, or, The wanton Wife. A Comedy. Written by *Mr. Betterton*. With his Effigies curiously engraven. Price 3 s. 6 d.

An Help and Exhortation to worthy Communicating, or, A Treatise describing the Meaning, worthy Reception, Duty and Benefits of the holy Sacrament. And answering the Doubts of Conscience, and other Reasons which most generally detain Men from it. Together with suitable Devotions added. By *John Kettlewell*, late Vicar of *Coles-Hill* in *Warwickshire*. The Sixth Edition. Price 4 s.

Human Souls naturally Immortal. Translated from a Latin manuscript, by *S. E.* With a Recommendatory Preface, by *Jeremy Collier*, M. A. 8°. Price 1 s.

Some

Some BOOKS lately printed and sold by Henry Clements at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-yard.

Sacred Biography, or, Scripture Characters. Illustrated in several Discourses. To which are added two Sermons preach'd before the University of Oxford. In the Years 1708 and 1709. By *Richard Theed, M. A.*

The Dissenters represented and condemn'd by themselves, on the Points of the occasion of their Ministry, the Constitution of their Churches, and their Separation from the Church of *England*. In a Letter to Mr. D. W. a Dissenting Teacher, to one of his Flock who went astray. Together with some farther Account of their Principles and Practices upon those Points.

An Answer to Mr. *de Fontenelle's* History of Oracles. Translated from the *French*. By a Priest of the Church of *England*. To which is prefix'd a Letter to the Translator. By the Reverend *George Hicke's, D. D.* In 2 Volumes.

A Treatise of the three Evils of the last Times. 1. The Sword. 2. The Pestilence. 3. The Famine, and of their Natural and Moral Causes. As also of the ensuing coming of Antichrist, according to the Notion of the ancient Fathers.

A Practical Exposition of the Church Catechism. In two Volumes. By *John Ollyffe, Rector of Dunton in Bucks.*

The True-Church-Man and Loyal Subject.

The English Grammar, or, An Essay on the Art of Grammar, applied to and exemplified in the English Tongue. By *Michael Maittaire.*

Reflections on Mens Prejudices against Religion, and their Mistakes in the Practice of it. Translated from the *French*. In two Parts.

The Principles of Deism truly represented and set in a clear Light. In two Dialogues between a Sceptick and a Deist. The first concerning the Christian Religion. The second concerning Natural Religion.

A short Paraphrase on the Book of *Psalms*. Whereby to render them the more easily intelligible to the vulgar Readers. By a Presbyterian of the Church of *England*.

Directions for the profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures. Together with some Observations for the confirming their divine Authority, and illustrating the difficulties thereof, By *William Lowth, B. D.* Prebendary of *Winchester*. The Second Edition.

Dr. *Wells's* controversial Treatises, in several Letters to a Dissenting Parishioner and a Dissenting Teacher.

